

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In our day the subject of personality occupies much attention. It has received new emphasis in current philosophy, and educational theorists are insisting that the true aim and end of education is the development of full and effective personality. It will be worth while to recall the Christian view on this subject, especially as we are naturally inclined to hold that Christian personality stands for the educational ideal of full and effective personality.

For the pattern and standard of Christian personality we turn to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ. We believe that He is 'the light of the world,' and that to follow Him is to have, or to put ourselves in the way of having, the 'light of life.'

But it is sometimes said that the principle of imitation, even of the imitation of Christ, is, in the last resort at least, a barrier rather than an aid to the ideal life, to the attainment of highest character, the achievement of true personality. Is not freedom of the essence of personality? Is not a person a voice, not an echo? But the objection has little more than theoretical force. What force it has, it probably owes to the dubious modern conception of personality as personal existence or identity, self-contained and impenetrable.

We need not, however, enter into the problem of personality. We may be content to affirm that

truly to follow Christ is not to hinder in oneself the realization of complete personal life. On the contrary, if we look to those who have asked Christ, in the phrase of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, to set down their names, and have then given themselves wholeheartedly to His service, we may learn of them what an enriching and enlarging experience it is to follow Christ, how it breaks down barriers and hindrances and sweeps the soul into freedom and power, how it enables a man to launch forth joyously into the fullness and depths of personal life, mind and heart and will united in one great allegiance.

What, then, is the Christian ideal of personal life? What is that 'light of life' which Christ holds up to us as a beacon of character and achievement? We might well approach the statement of the Christian ideal by first considering this question—How do Christian men and women reach the experience of religion? For some, religious experience is bound up with faith in Christ as their redeemer and saviour; for others, it is the response of obedience or loyalty to God, in whom the moral ideal is at once fulfilled and guaranteed. Perhaps religion comes to men and women at the present day in the second of these ways more than in the first—as a moral behest, a challenge to moral adventure, a signal and summons flashed from the heights of moral idealism.

Obedience is then one element in the Christian ideal of life, for most of us perhaps the primary and

central element. The very central truth of our religious experience is the hand of God upon us, urging us to rise above all meanness, selfishness, and calculating prudence, above all that divides and distracts our lives, into a life which is unified, integrated, and complete. The Christian is he 'that doeth the will.' Said Christ Himself, 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.'

But Christ also said, 'I am not alone': 'He that sent me is with me'; and this points to a second element in the Christian ideal, namely, *fellowship with God*. 'All my springs are in thee,' said the Psalmist; and this is a truth to lay hold of as we seek to pursue the way of obedience or loyalty to the Divine will, which is the way of moral enlargement and achievement. It should help us on that way to be in touch with the springs of our life, to lift up our eyes constantly unto the hills whence cometh our help.

The life of fellowship with God may also be regarded as one, not of upgoing towards Him, but of ingoing upon Him. For our God, in the well-known phrase of mystical religion, is the Beyond that is within. Thus it is but to uphold again the ideal of fellowship to lay stress on the need of cultivating spiritual faculty. If anything will secure for us that unification and integration of personality in which our highest life consists, it is the letting of ourselves go, so far as we may, into the infinite life of the eternal, indwelling God.

If one movement of the religious life as it leaves its central level is describable as upgoing towards God, or as ingoing upon Him, there is another movement which may be described as outgoing towards our fellows. Which brings us to the third element of the Christian ideal, namely, *social service*. Obedience, fellowship, service: from these three words taken together we may gain a true and rounded conception of life's ideal. The Christian life may begin as a life of obedience, but sooner or later it must carry itself into the double channel of fellowship and service. Through fellowship with God comes the inspiration of obedience;

through the service of humanity, its true fulfilment.

Surely we must welcome the new emphasis upon service in the modern statement of Christianity. The social ideal of our religion was largely lost sight of between the age of the Apostles and modern times, and only within recent years has it been recovered and freshly interpreted. Well it is that it has been. As men and women in the modern world, in which the social question presses, we should reject a religion that held no message of healing and hope for society, and for national and international life; that looked for no new social order on the earth for which it is our duty to labour. It is largely because the modern Christian Church as an organized institution has failed so far to strike the ethical or social note clearly enough, and to inspire its members with 'the enthusiasm of humanity' and the passion for humanitarian service, that so many spiritually minded men and women have been alienated from its fellowship.

It is then not God and self alone, but God and self and neighbour, that are at the making of true Christian personality. It needed the robbed and wounded Jew to make the Samaritan of the Parable what he is, namely, the Good Samaritan, the pattern for all time of brotherly love and service. He gave himself with his gifts, and he got a truer self back again. The true self is the fuller self. The more we merge our lives in the life and well-being of others, we receive them back again the richer and fuller. It is the grand paradox of personality, and part of the great truth of the social nature of all personal life—a truth to which modern thought has lent new meanings, but whose essential significance was grasped long ago by Him who said, 'He that loseth his life shall find it.'

Wherefore for the sake of the Kingdom of God as well as for the individual's sake we shall emphasize the importance of following the Christian ideal. Personal individuals are the units of the social order. 'It is in individual foci that the common life burns.' And the social order shall be redeemed only as its units reflect the Spirit of God and the

Mind of Christ. In sanctified and consecrated Christian personality lies the world's true hope.

Perhaps the most notable event in the theological world since the War has been the emergence of the Barthian school, whose leading exponents, besides Karl Barth, are Emil Brunner, Friedrich Gogarten, and Eduard Thurneysen. It is marked by a vigorous revival of the theology of the Reformers, expounded by men who are fully abreast of the critical and scientific thought of to-day. Its main points may be briefly indicated. It lays stress on the transcendence of God and the sinfulness and guilt of man. Revelation is God's gracious approach to man, not man's quest for God. Redemption is all of God; man has no power to redeem himself. All depends on faith and faith alone, but this faith becomes the most powerful, indeed the only real, ethical impulse. It should be added that these doctrines are expounded, not in the calm and detached spirit so characteristic of the critical theology of our time, but with a tremendous moral passion which at once arouses interest and carries conviction. To those who wish to make fuller acquaintance with the teachings of the Barthian school no better book can be recommended than *The Theology of Crisis*, by Professor H. Emil BRUNNER (Scribner's; 6s. net). Small in bulk, it is a garner full of the finest wheat. It makes much easier reading than Karl Barth's own work, and reveals BRUNNER as perhaps the best interpreter of the school.

In the introduction a strong plea is made for a return to serious theological thinking. 'Belief is the sap which creates the tree of life, with all its branches, big and little. . . . Among "Christians" and even among Christian theologians there are those who think that there are more urgent and practical tasks than that of theology, though theology has for its very problem the true understanding of human life. These people are like such gardeners as might think the branches of the tree more important than the sap because the branches are visible and the sap invisible.'

There follows some powerful and searching criticism of the theological thought of to-day, both Modernist and Fundamentalist. 'Christianity is either faith in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ or it is nothing. From this faith it derives its name, and has its peculiar content, its claim, its history. With it Christianity stands or falls. In the course of the last two centuries a process of transubstantiation has gone on which has resulted in something utterly distinct from Christian faith and theology. The science which is taught in most of our leading theological schools under the name of Christian theology ought rather to be called the science of religion. For the subject-matter is not the word of God, the revelation in Christ, but something totally different—religion, and perhaps revelation, in general. It seems very old-fashioned and unscientific to take theology in its original sense as the methodical study of the meaning of the word of God.' 'Truly, when the fundamentalists say that the modernists no longer hold the Christian faith, they are not far from telling the truth. . . . Modernism is by no means a newcomer in the realm of theology; it is even older than Christianity itself. It is essentially nothing more nor less than a repriming of later Platonism, either taking its form from the more ethically oriented Stoicism or from the Neoplatonic mysticism.'

The essence of this idealism is that man in the depths of his being is Divine, and that all he needs for salvation is the nurture of the Divine within him. If this be rejected as unchristian, are we driven back on the dilemma of being either scientific or Christian? BRUNNER holds that this dilemma is more apparent than real. 'Neither is the fundamentalist form of theology the same as Christian faith, nor is liberal Christianity truly scientific. Fundamentalism conflicts with science exactly because, and in so far as, it is not truly Christian; and liberal criticism is not truly Christian because, and in so far as, it is not truly critical. A third thesis may be added with propriety, namely, that only a Christian can be truly critical, and only he who is truly critical can be a Christian. The principles of true Christianity

and of true criticism are identical. Fundamentalism is a petrification of Christianity, and modernism is its dissolution.

Much modern thinking is blind to the fact of human sin and guilt. Liberalism has ever affirmed that the heart of man is *not evil*. Evil merely clings to man's heart, as the barnacles to the ship's hull. Man, therefore, may move upward towards God, and redemption is not really necessary. 'Modernism and fundamentalism are born of the same mother, that is, of the fear of sound critical thinking. But, let me add, this fear belongs to all of us. It is essentially part of the "old man"; nay, it is his very essence. It is the pride of the man who will not stand in the judgment of God, who will not concede that he is, really and wholly, a sinner, whose only salvation is the grace of God. Modernism digs itself in, before this unheard-of demand for confession of sin, behind an easy-going belief in the goodness of man and humanity; fundamentalism finds safety behind its orthodoxy and its ecclesiasticism.' But the truth must be faced. Man is a sinner, guilty before God and powerless to achieve his own salvation. The movement must come from God, and it does come in the Incarnate Word, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Man can but accept in faith the salvation which God has wrought in Christ. 'This apprehension of our helplessness and hopelessness and of the need and desire of deliverance, the New Testament calls repentance. Repentance is despair of self, despairing of self-help in removing the guilt that we have brought upon us. Repentance means a radical turning away from self-reliance to trust in God alone. Yes, to repent means to recognize self-trust to be the heart of sin.'

Does not this emphasis on man's helplessness tend to destroy moral initiative? This is the old ethical objection to the gospel of free grace. It might be sufficient to answer that history repels the objection. 'The times in which men expected nothing of themselves but everything of God were the epochs in which the greatest deeds were done.' Treating the point at more length, how-

ever, BRUNNER advances and defends the thesis that 'the *sola gratia, sola fide, soli deo gloria* of the Christian faith, that is, the Pauline view of faith, is the only solid foundation for ethics.' It is the only conception that goes to the root of the ethical problem. 'For morality is a matter of inner life and not of outward behaviour. All non-Christian ethics viewed from this central point is a sort of behaviourism, since it is more concerned with the action than the actor. To quote again a word of Luther: "It is not good works that make a good man, but a good man who does good works": that is, first the man and then his works; first the stand and power and then the leap; first the pure blood and then the healthy body; first the heart and then the acts.'

'One of the most fatal errors in the history of theology is the identification of the Biblical idea of the Kingdom with the rationalistic evolution and the optimistic theory of progress of the eighteenth century.' What has happened? The spirit of the West has absorbed the Christian faith. 'Instead of standing above the time process and so really dominating it, the Church, forgetting that her conversation is in heaven, has been dragged down into the world and is now driven about with its flotsam, and will ultimately, if this continues, become mere flotsam herself. In this fatal process the Kingdom of God plays a disastrous rôle. In modern theology and preaching it has been given a meaning directly opposite to that of the New Testament. . . . In the New Testament it means exactly that which man cannot do—the miracle by which God *ends* history and fashions His creation in ways and forms beyond imagination, beyond historical analogies, and beyond the reach of ethical attainment. It is a matter of faith and hope, and not of man's doing. Faith and hope, of course, are meant to have practical results—social, world-transforming effects. But they will bring this about only in proportion to the degree of their reality, that is, as they proceed from faith in God and not in man. Faith in God's doing is the salt of the earth which may preserve the world against decay and death. Faith in man is the salt that has lost its savour. It may be produced

in large quantities by methods of social and educational psychology, but it is part of the world, and therefore cannot preserve it. No one will deny that we must have a live Church which has an actual word to speak in our muddled condition. But what is the use of a Church which, in order to be up-to-date, has ceased to be a Church? We are losing the foolishness of the gospel because we are ashamed of it; and we are substituting for it a modern religious ethical programme which seems to be better fitted to our generation, but which, in fact, is only the wisdom of man, has no moving power, and ends in mere fussiness.'

In a very suggestive article in the current *Congregational Quarterly* on 'The Doctrine of the Fallibility of Jesus,' the Rev. A. D. MARTIN deals with a subject of the most vital moment. Was Jesus fallible either religiously or morally? Let us not be in doubt as to the issue. If He is fallible, then the Catholic conception of His person goes, and with it His Divinity and His uniqueness and indeed Christianity as a religion and as we have received it.

Mr. MARTIN quotes Professor Kirsopp Lake, who says that as the infallible Bible has gone, and the infallible Church, so the infallible Jesus must go too, if only because of His apocalyptic (and erroneous) teaching, and His illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God. But the real purpose of Mr. MARTIN's article is to deal with Dr. C. J. Cadoux's recent book on 'Catholicism and Christianity' and the passages in it bearing on the authority of Jesus. Apparently Dr. Cadoux is a believer neither in the religious nor in the moral perfection of Jesus.

Mr. MARTIN takes up Dr. Cadoux's points one by one. Some of these may be omitted as plainly not vital. But there are others that are vital. One is Jesus' prediction that He would return 'on the clouds within the space of one generation.' Mr. MARTIN contends that the language of Jesus here, as elsewhere, was poetic and symbolic. The dream

visions of *Enoch*, brilliantly imaginative descriptions of the heavenly world, can never have been meant to be taken literally. And this may be said of the apocalyptic literature generally. Why then literalize the words and pictures of Jesus? If His words are poetic and symbolic, then we can see also how great a *truth* His apocalyptic utterances contained.

It must be emphasized that if Jesus was mistaken in the main assertion He makes in these passages, then this mistake reveals a judgment that is not at one with the councils of God. 'Let us face facts,' says Mr. MARTIN. 'One of the amazing things to those of us who stand outside the high circles of scholarship, and claim no more than to be students of the New Testament, is the blindness or indifference of some great scholars to the consequences of their doctrines . . . the world will never be won into loyalty for a Lord who is shown to be a deluded enthusiast, however noble His sincerity and final martyrdom.'

Another question on which Dr. Cadoux finds the teaching of Jesus erroneous is that of eschatology, Gehenna fire and eternal punishment. This belief he stigmatizes as 'not only intellectually incredible, but morally outrageous.' Mr. MARTIN rather suggests that Dr. Cadoux is mistaken in thinking that Jesus actually held and taught this doctrine. Possibly. A case can be made out for that view. But even if He did hold it, is there not a great and solemn truth in the doctrine? If a soul clings to its sin, so that the sin becomes part of the fibre and being of the soul, can anything else than 'eternal punishment' describe its destiny? So long as a person holds to his sin, his suffering lasts. Sin and suffering are inseparable, and if a sinner goes on holding to his sin, he goes on suffering inevitably. To assert dogmatically that he must suffer only for a time is to deny any such thing as freedom. We are at liberty to sin, and go on sinning, and therefore eternal punishment is a dread possibility.

Mr. MARTIN turns from religious fallibility to moral imperfection. Dr. Cadoux doubts the sin-

lessness of Jesus. If He was sinless, why did He accept the baptism of repentance at John's hands? And why did He refuse to be called 'good' on the ground that only God can be good? And why did the author of Hebrews say that He 'learned obedience by the things that he suffered'? As to the last, it is surely obvious that the learning in Jesus' case did not imply disobedience. And that such an idea was far from the mind of the writer of Hebrews is clear from his own assertion that Jesus 'was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin.'

The words of Jesus to the rich young ruler refusing the title 'good' are explained by Mr. MARTIN ingeniously. Jesus said that we have all only one Father—God, and that we are not to call any man father on the earth. If we are to be quite literal, like Dr. Cadoux, this would mean that no one was ever to call his parent 'father' again. But does any one imagine such literalism to be the truth? Surely it means that God is so ideal a Father that by a paradox no one else has the right to the title. The words 'why callest thou me good,' etc., are an exact parallel.

This is very interesting. But may a simpler explanation not suffice? Mr. MARTIN hints at this himself when he speaks of 'the perhaps glib salutation, *Good Master*.' If it was glib and facile, did not Jesus wish to test the spirit of the young man? He often did this: witness His severe words to the would-be disciples in Lk 9—'What do you mean by good?' And why do you call Me 'good'? One is good—God. Why do you use such a term to Me? If Jesus meant to test the youth, is not His language sufficiently explained? As to His acceptance of the Baptism of John, is not this explained by the desire of Jesus to be identified in every way with the sons of men?

But apart from details of this kind, the language of Jesus about Himself is quite incompatible with a sense of sin. He was always severe and exacting about the fulfilment of duty. His standard was very high, His demands very searching. Yet never once was He known to confess any fault

in Himself, or (which is the very characteristic of sainthood) to acknowledge that only by the grace of God was He what He was. Contrast all this with St. Paul. And also remember the claim of Jesus, repeatedly made, that He Himself was to be the final Judge of men. Could such a claim be made by any sane being who knew Himself to be in any degree imperfect?

Mr. MARTIN has a fine passage in summing up the issue. Dr. Cadoux, after all his doubts and denials, would have us regard Jesus as uniquely Divine. But this is mere mental confusion, into which the plain man will refuse to be drawn. The only sense in calling Jesus Divine is to say something of Him which you can say of nobody else. The essence of the Divine is perfect holiness. That is what separates men (all men) from God. And that means an unflinching will and a mind that harbours no unworthy thought. This is what we say of Jesus, that He *always* willed the good, that He enjoyed unclouded fellowship and oneness with the Father because He was one with the good.

There are many things in the Bible we may be disposed to hold as doubtful. We may doubt the historical accuracy of the Gospels in detail. We may even believe that the stories of the Lord's birth are not part of the original Apostolic tradition. But when we lay hands on the sacred ark, the unique, infallible, Divine nature of Jesus Christ, we take away that 'which leaves us poor indeed.' We take away the foundation of any gospel of the grace of God. Such a Saviour as Jesus Christ, the holy, the Divine, 'became us,' because He was 'separate from sinners.' And the giving of such a Saviour is infinitely becoming to God.

The title of a book has something to do with its fate. With an apt or arresting title, it has at least a chance to make its way among those whom it concerns. We are not sure that Mr. Robert J. HUTCHEON was wise in accepting the suggestion of his friends for the title of his book, *Frankness in Religion* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), instead of

boldly devising one for himself. As he truly says, the title indicates the spirit rather than the contents of the book. But we are sure that he could have improved upon this by the discovery of a title which would have done more justice to the contents and perhaps even to the spirit.

For we hasten to say that this is a first-rate book. It is more than frank—it is courageous, with just the sort of courage that is needed to-day by religious thinkers in view of the new atmosphere created not only by historical criticism—with that we have now been familiar for a good while—but by psychology. The writer believes that ‘the great historical Christian system is in rapid decay’: but while he is critical, he is also constructive. He has helpful suggestions to make at every point of his varied discussion, and they are all the more helpful because he is well aware that the ultimate problems of life cannot be solved by thought alone. The heart has its reasons as well as the head, and in any large estimate of life the one has as good a right to be heard as the other.

A list of a few of the subjects dealt with will show how comprehensive Mr. HUTCHEON's discussion is—‘The Psychological Origin of Religion,’ ‘Revelation and Inspiration as Moments in the Creative Process,’ ‘Mysticism, its Limits and Present Possibilities,’ ‘Salvation as the Organization of Character,’ ‘What Makes the Bible Unique?’ ‘The Nature and Value of Faith,’ ‘The Person and Work of Jesus Christ,’ ‘The Meaning of God in Modern Thought,’ ‘Morality without Supernatural Sanctions.’ The very titles suggest in some cases the courage and unconventionality of the treatment.

The book is in effect a criticism of the current or traditional conception of religion and a plea for a re-examination and re-expression of it more in accordance with the modern mind. This is a task which the Church for quite intelligible reasons has been reluctant to assume, but such a reluctance, if persisted in, may well alienate some of the noblest minds in the community. ‘It is,’ as Mr. HUTCHEON says, ‘one of the immense calamities of history that the Church has been so conservative, so

wedded to its ancient creeds, so unprogressive in its ethical program.’

Certainly no one will accuse Mr. HUTCHEON of timidity in his criticism or reconstruction. We need, he tells us, not only a new valuation of the Bible, but a new valuation of Jesus; and here are some of the challenging things he says in this connexion. ‘We must make the Cross represent not merely the sacrifice of one heroic spiritual personality but the sacrifices for noble ends of all the spiritual heroes of all races and of all times’ (p. 127). ‘It is historically true that the Cross has concealed Jesus from the world rather than revealed Him’ (p. 241). The Christian theologian ‘has tied up his recognition of the spiritual greatness of Jesus to a theological dogma which has robbed Jesus of His real humanity. Hence, instead of regarding Jesus as the first among many brethren and thus doing justice to the original spiritual element in all noble men, he has made the many brethren too utterly dependent on the one great brother’ (p. 256). Again, ‘Paul’s doctrine of the Cross is not a step in advance of Jesus or the prophets, but a step backward. It is an attempt to interpret the significance of Jesus in the terms of a system of thought which the prophets and Jesus repudiated’ (p. 242); and the interminable theological controversies about the Person of Christ have deflected attention from His supreme value as ‘a living example of the will to righteousness.’

All this is challenging enough, and Mr. HUTCHEON is well aware that any attempt at re-statement will be hotly resented by minds of the traditional sort. Nevertheless he pursues his way through his long argument with a fine sense of perspective and with a profound appreciation of the spiritual values which, in the end, are the things of ultimate importance to the traditionalists themselves. His reverence for Jesus, for example, is not a whit less than theirs. But in his re-statement he concentrates upon the prophetic quality of the Bible and gives short shrift to its ritual and sacerdotal aspects. ‘Refine their [*i.e.* Protestant Fundamentalists] doctrine of the atonement through the blood of Christ as they may, it derives from the cultus and

not from the ethical faith of the prophets.' Mr. HUTCHEON is alive to 'The Values of Worship,' on which he writes an admirable chapter; but in his attitude to essential religion, he resolutely takes his place beside the prophet, not beside the priest.

It is interesting to compare his treatment of Mysticism with that of Professor Rufus M. Jones in his recently published volume on 'Some Exponents of Mysticism,' noticed elsewhere in this number. Mr. HUTCHEON agrees with Professor Morgan that the mystic's profundity is 'a sham profundity.' The mystic is attempting to soar into regions inaccessible to man on his present level of being. The world into which the Bible introduces us is not the world into which we are ushered by the writings of the mystics. 'In attempting to transcend himself and the world the mystic only lands in the abyss.'

The challenges in which this book abounds are all inspired by a thoroughly constructive motive. It is because he has so supreme a regard for the spiritual values represented by religion that Mr. HUTCHEON desires such an intellectual apprehension and expression—he would hardly say formulation—of them as will commend itself to the modern

mind. Nothing, for example, could be more to the point than his salutary and far from unnecessary warning to teachers and students in theological schools. It is possible, he reminds them, to concentrate so severely upon questions of archæology, Biblical criticism, documentary analysis, the Synoptic problem, and so forth, as to leave little or no time for the presentation of the one thing which constitutes, after all, the *raison d'être* of the Bible, namely, 'the religious faith and moral passion which made the prophets and psalmists what they were.'

This is a stimulating and valuable book, especially searching on its psychological side. It will stir the blood of those who desire to play their part in the necessary task of clothing the great inheritance of the past in a modern dress. But far more than new formulations of truth, however admirably adapted to our own age, do we need a new access of life, a new elevation of spirit. Most of us will therefore agree with Mr. HUTCHEON that 'the greatest need among educated circles is not for more knowledge but for more life, more kindling power, more moral drive, more confidence in moral ideals and more mystic fervour in presenting them to others.'

God and Mr. Middleton Murry.

By CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D., CANON OF LIVERPOOL AND CHAPLAIN TO THE KING.

EVER since the publication of Mr. William James' Gifford Lectures, the argument from mystic experience has been the refuge of the Christian apologist. The breakdown of the scholastic system with the triumph of the inductive method, the breakdown of Biblical Protestantism under the assaults of historical and critical study, the failure of constructive theologians to popularize the results of their labours, have combined to create bewilderment in the Churches. The reaction against materialism, the distrust of analysis, and of intellectualism, and the need for a restated religion,

have opened the way to interest in the esoteric. In the appeal to a direct and unarguable conviction, such as mysticism claimed to supply, there seemed to be a sanctuary inviolable. A murmur of the word 'numinous,' a reference to Plotinus or St. Theresa, an allusion to the dark night of the soul—and we could dispense with the effort to think out our faith, and could justify any superstition by its power to evoke rapture.

It has long been evident to many of us that this relapse into the anti-rational would be short-lived or else disastrous. Far-sighted theologians, like

Dr. Tennant, warned us that we should 'do well to call nonsense by its name'¹; or else, like Canon Quick,² rightly refusing this total rejection of mysticism, pleaded that such experience must be rigidly and scientifically tested. The warnings fell on deaf ears. It was safe to predict that having discovered so attractive a short-cut, we should follow it blindly until its safety was more popularly challenged. Mr. Middleton Murry, whatever the value of his book, has laid the advocates of a reasonable faith under a great obligation. His own reputation, the beauty, sincerity, and insight of his writing, his sympathetic, if mistaken, interpretation of Jesus and of Christianity should give his work a circulation which the Churches cannot ignore. It will not be easy in future to rely upon an unexamined mysticism.

For Mr. Murry, acknowledging Jesus as 'the New Man,' and admitting His uniquely creative influence, sets out to expound a philosophy on the basis of that high experience which he has shared with the mystics of all ages. He appreciates the value of this experience both for the individual and for religion; he repudiates the attempt to explain it away under the categories of physical or rationalistic concepts; he has a firm grasp upon wholeness of personality; he sees that man must live by inward constraint of his own nature and not by law imposed from without; he gives unstinted appreciation to the grandeur of Orthodox Christianity; he admits the organic unity and apparently the purposive order of the universe; but he parts company with God.

From the standpoint of non-Roman Christianity it might be sufficient to say that in his refusal to admit any Christianity except that of Rome, and in his quite unjustifiable assumption that the Christianity of Rome is the Christianity of Jesus, he has been guilty of an omission and an assertion which in combination vitiate his whole argument. If it is, as he maintains, foolishness or dishonesty to call oneself a Christian unless one accepts the Roman Catholic Church, there is no more to be said. Let us then find some other name for those who accept, as sincerely as any Roman, the religion of Jesus, and who by doing so differ as widely from Mr. Murry as from what he calls Christianity. We shall politely decline to accept his alternative, and shall regret that, on certain

pages³ of his book he has written with a petulance unworthy of him or of his theme.

But it is not enough to protest that the dilemma in which he would place us is one of his own devising; that we refuse to admit the claim of Rome to be the sole and legitimate heir to Jesus; and that we do not find it necessary to accept his philosophy as an alternative. His book is far too fine to be brushed aside, even though in treating of Christianity it contains an obvious fallacy. For there are few who have perceived so plainly the real issue of our time, or have made so fine an attempt to understand and examine the significance of the vital core of religion.

Still less is it sufficient to point out that there is, despite his protests, nothing very new either in his experience or his philosophy. Very many of us have known such an event as he describes, and its resultant conviction of unity in the self and in the universe and of communion between them; and it is disappointing to find him claiming a singularity for his quite frequent type of illumination. Nor is his philosophy novel except in its terminology. The great Stoics, several of whom were evidently mystics, stressed as he does the duty of harmony between the self and the *anima mundi*, the need for wholeness and self-mastery, and the calm which is the reward of self-acceptance and self-sufficiency; and Epictetus has revealed the effects of such a faith in language at once warmer and more beautiful than Mr. Murry's. In recent times Auguste Comte has put forward a similar religion with a wealth of learning that Mr. Murry certainly does not possess. Nor is the special stress upon evolutionary emergence a new feature. Many recent volumes, such as Dr. Lloyd Morgan's *Life, Mind, and Spirit*, Professor Hocking's *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, Professor Haldane's *The Sciences and Philosophy*, and Professor Whitehead's Gifford Lectures,⁴ accept all the premises of Mr. Murry's work, have an equally clear experience, and a much wider knowledge, reject with him the crude dualism of supernatural and natural, and yet differ wholly from his conclusions. It is a pity that he should ignore such work and permit himself to accuse those who do not with him deny God either of ignorance—'they have not thought it out'—or of 'base equivocation.' But, again, the validity of his conclusions must not be dismissed without examination simply

¹ *Philosophical Theology*, i. p. 321. Dr. Tennant in this section of his work gives an importance to the logical intelligence which is hardly consistent with his chapter upon Rationalism and Empiricism.

² Cf. his articles in *Theology*, Oct.-Dec. 1927.

³ E.g. pp. 229-230, or p. 272.

⁴ These are only typical; there is, of course, a very large literature covering the ground of Mr. Murry's volume.

because, like other prophets, he overestimates his own originality, and has not made a full study of the work of others.

In itself the book is based upon certain experiences in its author's life, poignant in themselves, and beautifully described, which qualify him as no amount of second-hand knowledge could do for the task of interpreting religion. He has been down into hell, the hell of loneliness and agony, and spiritual inanition. He has been rapt into heaven, the heaven of realized unity. He condemns all materialistic or behaviourist attempts to explain away his experience; and all mechanical, legalistic, dualistic, or ecclesiastical schemes of conduct and 'philosophies' of life. He sets himself to examine and test his experience and interpret it in naturalistic and organic concepts. He produces a result which he believes to cover all the data, to give a full appreciation of Jesus and Christianity, to expose the grounds on which men have created God, and to advance beyond the need for Him. He admits that only those who have shared his experience will understand his position, or accept his denials. But quite evidently he has reached an honest conclusion, and finds it sufficient and satisfying as well as, for himself, intellectually necessary. There is in him nothing of shallow or facile rebellion; no desire to be shocking or clever or literary; no sign of affectation or of wilful self-delusion. He 'can no other'; and as such, and because he deals reverently with matters of supreme importance, he deserves the gratitude of careful consideration.

It is abundantly plain from his misinterpretation of the Messiahship of Jesus¹ that his own temperament is of the twice-born order. He reached his illumination in recoil from a period of intense suffering and inward strife. He claims that this is the normal preparation for mystic experience. In so doing I believe he is profoundly mistaken. Rapture of this order is not the highest type of mysticism; it has in it a large element that is obviously pathological; and its results cannot be accepted as conclusive however carefully they be scrutinized. For in such cases the organism has been subjected to an intolerable strain; it snaps; an overwhelming relief is the immediate result. It does not necessarily follow that the consequent sense of unity is unreal or illusory; but it is certainly a relatively low type, as compared with that which emerges from a period of sublimation and

integration. In Mr. Murry's case this verdict is confirmed by his admissions, first, that his mystic experience is indistinguishable in its awareness of an all-pervading Unity from that produced by anæsthetics;² and secondly, that whereas his former experience produced a conviction of the reality of God, it was only after the anæsthetic that he saw clearly that God was an illusion.³ I have examined at some length, and summarized elsewhere,⁴ the evidence of the relationship of genuine to artificially induced mysticism; and the conclusion appears to be that though a measure of unification can be produced under the influence of ether or hashish or alcohol, when the psychic state is simplified by the suppression of its contacts, this is a vastly different experience from that which occurs when every element of the personality at its fullest is brought into unity. Mr. Murry's type of rapture is admittedly more akin to the former than to the latter; it is attained by exhaustion at the end of a period of ascetic renunciation, not by the emergence of a new level of vitality upon a psychic state of full and harmonious enlargement. The higher ranges of personality are disclosed when every vital power is at its highest, not when the self is drugged or devitalized.

The first criticism to be passed upon the book is therefore that the data on which its conclusions are based are inadequate. They are not evidence for humanity at its highest.

Mr. Murry seems conscious of this; for he desires to base his philosophy upon grounds other than those supplied by his mysticism. He would defend the wholeness of the self, the relationship between its unity and the organic unity of the universe as true, even apart from their verification in mysticism. Here much of what he has to say is quite admirable. He describes with real insight the relation between the whole self and the intellect; he deals faithfully with the rationalist who thinks that he can simplify life into a logical schema, or interpret it by materialistic or mechanistic analogies, and not less faithfully with the Christian who introduces the supernatural in order to redress the defects of the natural. He is right in insisting that all is natural, that the pure ego is not amenable to complete intellectual formulation, that man must learn to live in response to the constraint of his own whole self and not by rule and rote, that the universe is so ordered that this which seems like anarchy is in fact its opposite and the means of true progress. All this, of course, many of us who call ourselves Christians have been

² P. 129.

³ P. 315, as compared with p. 121.

⁴ *Creator Spirit*, pp. 244-247.

¹ This mistake will be obvious to any close student of the New Testament; it is not relevant to the main thesis of his book, and is therefore not discussed here.

saying even more unequivocally than he; and it was said implicitly and explicitly both by Jesus and by St. Paul. But along with it there is much on which he is vague, while they are definite; and something that he denies and they affirm. For us these are the issues of principal moment.

His vagueness is most manifest in his treatment of what he calls 'the organic unity of the Universe.' In certain places he speaks of this as perhaps better described as 'the biological unity of life,' and apparently means by it nothing more than that between matter, life, and consciousness there is a continuity, and that we must interpret the Universe as the expression of a single order of being. This, if this is all, is certainly a minimal interpretation of the mystic's apprehension, and of Mr. Murry's organic unity. It fails to give any account of the characteristic conviction of every mystic that the universe is not merely one but friendly, and that he is in communion with it. It needs no mysticism, but only an elementary common sense to maintain as much as this.

But there are many phrases, apparently essential to his argument, in which he seems to mean far more than this. 'We believe that the Universe as organic unity striving after self-creation through the individual . . . is a satisfying object of contemplation' is, of course, a confession exactly appropriate to Mr. Wells' 'struggling god.' When he assigns to the Universe an 'inherent organic urge towards newness,'¹ and when he states that 'the world-organism is so admirably devised that those who might be deprived by it' (by the doctrine that man is not a moral being) 'will not believe it,'² he ascribes to this organism a purpose and plan of its own, wholly independent of man or of mankind. Here he approaches that analogy between the microcosm and the macrocosm which led the Stoics to their concept of the Logos or Pnuma in the Universe, and but for the archaic materialism which they borrowed from Heraclitus would have transformed a rather barren metaphysic into an authentic if tenuous religion.³ He is indeed on the verge of becoming theistic, when he states his faith in one 'too vast to be my friend, too intimate to be my enemy,'⁴ one 'mysterious and vast, mighty and intimate.'⁵ Realizing that such a being is not unlike God, he shows signs of an eminently unmetabiological exasperation⁶—a sure

proof that he is not quite sure how far he has committed himself.

We do not propose to incur his threatened wrath by suggesting that, if pressed, his admissions would convict him of theism. Rather we agree that the organic unity of the Universe forced upon him by experience is kept so subsidiary to what is without it pure positivism, as to be unworthy of the name of God. Certainly, in the sense in which we speak of God, he is a God-denier; for to him the organic unity of the Universe is only a means to his own self-integration. Religion cannot be satisfied with a creed so evidently self-centred. Mr. Murry's goal is self-acceptance, the Christian's goal is love; between the two there is the difference between the centripetal and the centrifugal, between Lucifer and Jesus.

Yet by his vagueness about the Universe, Mr. Murry in fact vitiates his claim to provide a coherent and inclusive philosophy. When he states: 'If the insistence upon God becomes more serious, we meet it not with a mere refusal, but with an insuperable difficulty. The new calculus explains God, but God cannot explain the new calculus. The new calculus includes the old; the old does not include the new,'⁷ his statement must be sharply challenged. He allows the existence and objectivity of the Universe: he is no solipsist or subjective idealist; yet he brushes aside all the problems as to its origin and nature, its order and purpose, as if they did not exist. Now it may well be that the old arguments, ontological, cosmological, and teleological, do not amount to demonstration; the form in which they have been traditionally stated is open to serious criticism; but it is certainly unjust to claim that the new includes the old, when the new makes no attempt whatever to take these huge questions into its purview. It is very easy for Mr. Murry with these judicious omissions to suggest that we can 'dispense with God when we can carry his burden.' Does he seriously suppose that we can carry the burden of the creation, maintenance, ordering, and purposive movement of the Universe? He admits order and purpose in the nature of things; he neither explains them in terms of organism, nor could do so without lapsing into theism. Presumably he is content to be agnostic in these matters; if so, he cannot claim inclusiveness for his calculus. If the Universe is an organism, its organic life is certainly not the life of the creatures domiciled within it, and an integral part of it. There must be some *élan vital* at least; some power not our-

¹ P. 176; cf. p. 233.

² P. 298.

³ This change is actually made by some of them, e.g. in the hymn of Cleanthes.

⁴ P. 74.

⁵ P. 281.

⁶ P. 277.

⁷ P. 280.

selves that makes it not for righteousness, at any rate for wholeness; 'where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare if thou knowest' is still a challenge that cannot be airily ignored.

It is indeed curious that a book claiming to provide a complete and coherent philosophy should be utterly silent upon matters with which every philosopher hitherto has found himself compelled to deal. The *De natura rerum* is a poem which Mr. Murry quotes; he dismisses Lucretius' solution, as he does all materialistic interpretations. Yet beyond a somewhat imaginative sketch of Lamarckianism, he provides no sort of substitute. Only two paragraphs, so far as I can discover, deal with the issue at all, and these contradict one another. In one he states: 'It is impossible for the intellect to conceive how that supremely personal God who is the sum and harmony of all human perfections can be responsible for the world of pain and imperfection that we know'¹—a dogmatic statement which occurs in a section describing Christianity, but which he repeats in altered language later in the same chapter.² In the other, after admitting that 'if the real really is horrible, then assuredly luckless humanity is perfectly justified in erecting the ideal to nullify it,'³ he goes on to point out that 'the real has contained many very wonderful achievements of man, heroisms, beauties, imaginations, and inventions. It enables these wonderful emergences to endure.'⁴ For such a world it is surely not impossible to regard God as responsible. I think Mr. Murry, if he had thought it out, might admit that as he could accept such a world, God might do so too. Admittedly the problem is hard; but no complete philosophy can dismiss it with a dogmatic assertion.

It is not, however, enough for us to show that Mr. Murry is mistaken in claiming completeness for his scheme. Certainly, without facing such issues, he has fully understood the need for God, and is therefore on his own showing not yet justified in dispensing with Him. Nevertheless he might still be right so far as he goes; and if so, though we might keep room for God to explain the organic unity of the Universe, God will be only a 'First Cause,' an *élan de vie*, a principle of creative emergence. If the testimony of mankind, if the heart and mind of man have no use for Him except to bear the burden of causality, He will certainly mean less to us than He meant to Jesus; and we may be left with self-acceptance instead of loving worship as our goal.

¹ P. 224.

² P. 231.

³ P. 307.

⁴ P. 308.

Our final task, therefore, is to turn to the field in which Mr. Murry is most at home, and to ask whether in point of fact the interpretation of mystic experience, on which his whole case really rests, is adequate. Is his mysticism the supreme type of such experience? Is his account of it sufficient to explain, for example, the mysticism of Jesus? And if not, how far does this defect invalidate his findings?

It has already been argued that, in fact, a mysticism induced as the result of long mental and emotional conflict is of a relatively low type. The records of mystics are full of cases of this sort where sheer exhaustion, often deliberately achieved by a discipline of ascetic rigour, by self-torture, or by prolonged devotional exercises, is followed by an ecstasy. The methods of purgation can be studied in detail, and have been elaborated into a regular technique, and it is possible to detect various levels both of preparation and of consequent experience. The lowest grade would seem to be that produced by drugs or anaesthesia where the cutting off of sensuous consciousness establishes a dream-state giving a vague apprehension of unity, but often broken by phantasies and nightmares. Next, there is the rapture attained through intense concentration on a crystal or a light, or the monotonous repetition of a formula, when unification is reached by the diminution and focussing of the field of awareness. Next to this comes the ecstasy of exhaustion when the conscious life, worn out by suffering or by a fierce struggle between animal passions and moral control, sinks into lassitude. The process is analogous to, and perhaps connected with, the operation of the sympathetic nerve upon acute physical pain. When torpor has been reached, the resulting calm floods in upon the sufferer as an intense and beatific release. The tortured self recovers the sense of its own unity, and an overwhelming conviction that all is well. I have examined a number of cases similar to that of Mr. Murry, and find abundant testimony to the accuracy of his description; and in most of them a definite conviction of the reality of God, a conviction interpreted as a swooning into peace and security, a sinking into the embrace of the infinite. I hesitate to describe such experiences as merely pathological; for, like Mr. Murry, I believe that if carefully tested and freed from the hallucinations which often accompany them they have a real validity. Their intensity, enhanced as it is by contrast with what has gone before, is for the recipient compelling and revolutionary. Here is indeed a new birth. But they belong to the level

of passive mysticism, where the dominant impression is of the unity and changeless quietude of the universe, apprehended as a living organism, of which the mystic is an integral part, and in which he can rest secure.

Some will maintain that this and this only should be called mysticism, and that more active states ought to be given another name—perhaps that of inspiration. In reality this passive experience seems merely a lower level of what is at a higher stage creative and dynamic. For beyond the mysticism of exhaustion is the mysticism of sublimation, the experience that emerges when the whole self is fully integrated and alert, and is then possessed and energized by a power transcendent and evidently universal, yet akin and intimately united with itself. Mr. Murry is by temperament and profession a critic, detached, judicious, and on his own admission self-centred and somewhat inhuman. It is possible that he has had little or no acquaintance with the creative artist's rapture or the inspiration of the man of genius. Yet these are indisputably of a mystic type, and supervene not upon morbidity but, as Nietzsche has insisted, upon 'a great healthiness.'¹ Nietzsche is, I conclude, a witness whom Mr. Murry will accept, so it may be worth quoting his exposition of his own creative activity. 'The idea of revelation in the sense that something which profoundly convulses and upsets one becomes suddenly visible and audible with indescribable certainty and accuracy—describes the simple fact. One takes—one does not ask who gives. There is an ecstasy so great that the immense strain of it is sometimes relaxed by a flood of tears. There is a depth of happiness in which the most painful parts do not act as antithesis to the rest, but are required as necessary colour in such an overflow of light. Everything happens quite involuntarily, as if in a tempestuous outburst of freedom, of absoluteness, of power and divinity. This is my experience and inspiration.'²

Instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely of this type of rapture, ranging from a simple conviction that words or actions are 'given' to the supreme achievements of the *Gott-beirnen* and of the Incarnate. A graduated series can easily be constructed here as in passive mysticism. Many of us have felt at moments of high vitality, the breaking in upon us of a visitant who possesses

and thrills of a universal life, not our own, which has about it the quality of personality. Examining such moments, we can see that there has been a preparatory period of purgation bringing the personality into tone, and capable of being described and consciously followed. The experience itself is less catastrophic, but certainly not less convincing. It is no mere swooning into the peace of the infinite, but the inbreathing of one who fills and floods us with his energy, lifts us on to a plane of being far above our own level, and controls us irresistibly, so that we become for a span the instruments of His will. The higher grades of initiate are still more conscious alike of the grandeur and of the personality of the power that inspires them. There is here more than organic unity: it is unity; it is organic: but it is friend, comrade, lover, and that not by any imaginative hypostatization, but by the evidence of the character of the experience. Such mystics receive all that Mr. Murry describes of illumination, of security, of unity within, and unity between them and the universe; but the agent of their inspiration is no passive comforter, but active, demonic, divine; and its effect is not a quiet glow of recovered confidence, but an ardour of intense and throbbing rapture. In their hour they are possessed by a passion of creativeness; there emerges in them a new birth; they are men transfigured, every faculty being raised to its highest power, attuned to a harmony of poised and effective energy, and then charged with the influx of acknowledged Deity. In them the universal finds expression; through them God manifests Himself. Moreover, and this is the point of chief importance, the worth of their inspiration, because expressed in action, can be tested in its effects by the ordinary methods of critical judgment.

It is impossible to study the evidence for the higher ranges of human experience without recognizing that mystics of Mr. Murry's type do not gain enough from their ecstasy to speak clearly, and often remain self-centred. For themselves their experience may be valid; but the rest of us can only appreciate it indirectly by studying its influence upon them. Those of a more positive and healthy order are not only far more definite as to the quality and 'values' of the Universal, but, once having known rapture, escape from primary concern about themselves and their own significance. The almost morbid anxiety which Mr. Murry shows concerning the worth of his book, or its originality as a 'new metabiological variation,' is utterly unlike the freedom of the active

¹ *Ecce homo*, p. 96. Cf., for this and many other instances, J. Y. Simpson, *Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion*, pp. 61-74.

² *Loc. cit.* p. 96 ff.

mystic, and would of itself raise the suspicion that his liberation had not been complete. The higher mystics are not troubled about their own madness or sanity; they are not thinking about themselves; they have lost their lives and found them in the life of that which has possessed them; they care about God and other people; they seek not to do their own will, but the will of Him that sent them; they are men utterly dedicated. They are creative; and their creations await our criticism: the tree can be judged by its fruits. Like Mr. Murry they seek wholeness, not goodness nor any lesser thing, but it is wholeness not in the integrated unity of their own personalities, but in the unity of the universal; and because they seek that which is outside themselves they achieve their own fulfilment on the way. Those who would escape the futilities of the self-involved, those who would develop their 'pure personality' to the uttermost, will not do so until they have ceased to be the centres of their own interest. 'Seek ye first God's kingdom and righteousness' is a higher precept than 'Accept thyself': it is also vastly more effective.

Of this high type of mystic Jesus is a unique example. By His own admission, by the evidence of His character, by the testimony of His followers, 'in Him was God.' None can question that His whole activity was dominated by the conviction of God's reality, of God's perfection, of God's love, and of God's accessibility. Few men have paid

a finer tribute to His creative influence or human splendour than Mr. Murry; and, in addition, he admits that living in the first century Jesus could have given no other account of Himself or of the Universe than what He gave. If, as we believe, His life was even more consistent and majestic than our author will allow, if, as we have argued, His total consecration to the doing of the Father's will raises His character and His mystical union above the level of all others, and differentiates Him as God-centred from all who find their centre in self-acceptance, we cannot but maintain that those who saw in Him the image of the invisible God were justified. It was right and inevitable that He should be acknowledged as God incarnate. When, under the influence of other and perhaps irreconcilable concepts of deity, the Church went on to detach Him from the natural order and formulate a doctrine of His person in terms of an antithesis between natural and supernatural, it was, in fact, falling away from its own confession. Such an antithesis, though accepted by Catholic Orthodoxy and approved by Mr. Murry, is fundamentally opposed alike to the mystic experience, to the teaching of Jesus, and to belief in an incarnation. We cannot be true to both Jesus and to such a dualism. It is because he does not realize this that Mr. Murry's dilemma, either Catholicism and Jesus as divine, or the total denial of Christianity, is based upon a fallacy.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

III. The Contribution of Germany to Old Testament Study.

By PROFESSOR A. R. GORDON, D.D., UNITED THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, MONTREAL.

THIS contribution has been as wide as it is deep. It covers the whole range of study, from grammar and lexicography to the 'weightier matters' of faith and life. Instead, however, of splitting the subject into various sections, which would produce little more effect than that of a catalogue, I have thought it better to concentrate upon a few outstanding personalities, the beacon lights through whom the main lines of advance have been guided from one generation to another.

The decisive impulse to a genuine study of the Old Testament was given by Luther, when he brushed away the cobwebs of scholastic exegesis

—its prevailing idea of the manifold sense of Scripture, and its extravagant and tasteless allegorizing—and insisted on 'one simple, appropriate, certain, literal sense,' understood in the light of the context, taking into account times, circumstances, and conditions, and having due regard to the 'proportion of faith,' that is, the place of the passage in the perspective of the revelation of God in Christ. These broad principles of interpretation, it will be seen, contain the germs of what was to develop into textual, historical, literary, and spiritual criticism.

The freedom thus won by Luther was soon lost

in a recrudescence of dry scholasticism, which treated the Scriptures no longer as the bread and water of life, but as a quarry of proof-texts for the buttressing of rival creeds, giving too good ground for Werenfels' epigram :

This is a book in which each one seeks his own dogmas,
And in which likewise each one finds his own dogmas.

Deliverance from the bondage of bibliolatry came from two very diverse quarters, evangelical piety and Biblical criticism. The two influences were most happily combined in the leading Biblical scholars of the eighteenth century: men like Spener, the father of Pietism, who prayed God to save men from 'interpreting Scripture according to creeds, and so erecting a veritable popedom in the midst of the Church'; Bengel, the author of the incomparable *Gnomon*, whose first principle of interpretation was 'Put nothing into the Scriptures, but draw the full meaning out of them, suffering nothing that is in them to remain hid'; and Ernesti, author of the standard *Elements of Interpretation*, who proceeded from the assumption, 'Of course the Scriptures are to be investigated by the same rules as other books.' No one, however, did more to open men's minds to the Divine beauty and truth of the Bible, especially the Old Testament, than Herder, the poet-preacher of Weimar. A man of unusual sensibility, he was from his earliest years fascinated by the poetry of the Bible, 'with its tenderness, its grave wisdom, and its solemnity.' His later variety of interests only intensified his love for the Bible, which for him remained the crown of all literature and the fountain of eternal life. But, he urged, 'The best way to read this Divine book is the human—taking that word in its broadest sense and its most vital significance. The more humanly you read the Word of God, the closer you come to the mind of its Author, who formed man in His image, and in all the deeds of power and grace in which He reveals Himself as our God works for us in human wise.' From this human standpoint Herder wrote two books which have had a far-reaching influence on Old Testament study: his charming *Songs of Love* (1778), a new version of the Song of Songs, arranged, with rare prescience of the trend of recent criticism, as forty-four independent love-songs, held together 'by no closer link than that of a bunch of fine pearls on one string,' and his classical work on *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (1782), a kind of rhapsody on the poetry of the Old Testament—

'the poetry of friendship between man and God'—which is still unequalled for insight into the heart and soul of that literature.

Herder's work was inspirational rather than scientific. It was necessary, therefore, that the intuitions of his genius should be supplemented by keen, penetrating criticism based on thorough knowledge of Hebrew and its cognate languages. This contribution was made in masterly fashion by his friend Eichhorn, whom Cheyne has justly described as 'the founder of modern Old Testament criticism.' Eichhorn was prepared for his task by a liberal course of studies in Classical and Oriental literature, while his general culture was stimulated by his friendship with Herder and Goethe. His great *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1780-1783) is a fine combination of critical acumen and literary feeling. It is in this book that the distinction is first drawn between Lower Criticism, which concerns itself with problems of the text, and Higher Criticism—'a new name to no humanist'—which deals with the more complex questions of authorship, composition, and date. Eichhorn's main contribution to Higher Criticism was his rediscovery of the key which Astruc had first applied to the solution of the problem of Genesis, viz. the alternation of the Divine names Jahweh and Elohim, though he saw that literary considerations were equally involved in the problem, and analysed the book in a far more constructive way than Astruc had done. He had also a clear perception of the later date of books like Deutero-Isaiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Daniel. To this was added a warm appreciation of the qualities of the literature. This appreciation was, no doubt, more æsthetic than religious. All the more on that account did it appeal to the romantic tendencies of the age. Of Eichhorn, no less truly than of Herder, it might be said, in Dorner's words, that he 'reconquered, so to speak, the Old Testament for German literature.'

Eichhorn's work had the defects of its merit. Often a robe of rhetoric veiled a lack of thoroughness and accuracy. In these respects Eichhorn found his true counterpart in his illustrious pupil Gesenius. His nature was more rationalistic than poetic. He loved exactitude in detail rather than broad literary effects. Though he lectured on the whole field of Old Testament literature, his real interest was in linguistics. His contribution to this department of study was of fundamental importance. His *Hebrew Grammar* (first published in 1813), followed by his exhaustive *Syntax of the Hebrew Language* (1817), and especially his *Hebrew*—

German Dictionary (1812), which appeared in a new form as the *Manual Lexicon* (1833), and was finally expanded into the monumental *Thesaurus philologicus criticus* (1826-58), laid a solid basis for all future study of Hebrew, and in successive revisions are still standard works in all our Colleges.

Gesenius' sole contribution to exegesis was his *Commentary on Isaiah* (1820-21), a work of immense erudition, sane and balanced in judgment, with a sure grasp of the prophet's function as 'a herald and watchman of the theocracy and the theocratic faith,' though from his rationalistic standpoint he quite failed to do justice to the prophet's religious idealism.

The qualities so conspicuously wanting in Gesenius were richly supplied by Eichhorn's still more illustrious pupil, Heinrich Ewald, that erratic, arbitrary, dogmatic, but singularly arresting and inspiring figure. Ewald had a real gift of divination, and a dæmonic energy of purpose. As a youth he had caught from Herder and Eichhorn the spell of the East, and he felt called to be a prophet of the light that shone from the East. In preparation for his task he flung himself into philological studies of a wide variety of Oriental tongues, especially Arabic, which he rightly judged to be the necessary key to the understanding of Hebrew language and literature. Apart from his quixotic sally into the field of Hexateuchal criticism—an essay on the *Composition of Genesis*, which he published in 1823, at the early age of nineteen—his first contributions to scholarship were treatises on Arabic and Sanskrit metres, followed at a short interval by Hebrew and Arabic Grammars, which already showed his native genius. Gesenius had been content to set the forms of speech in clear, dry light; Ewald sought to reduce them all to their underlying principles. Thus even in dealing with the rudiments he breathed the breath of life into the dead bones.

With this equipment Ewald embarked on the true work of his life, the interpretation of the literature, history, and religion of the Bible. He began, significantly enough, with the poetical books of the Old Testament, on the ground that in them we are brought most directly to the fountain-heads of spiritual life in Israel. The series opened in 1826 with an exposition of the Song of Songs as a drama of true love tried and triumphant—a theory which is still supported, with modifications, in Driver's *Introduction* and Rothstein's article in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. This was followed in 1835 by the illuminating *Commentary on Psalms*; within another year the noble volume on Job appeared;

and next year Proverbs and Ecclesiastes were added. In 1839 Ewald published his general reflections on Hebrew poetry, which broke new ground along various lines. From this point of vantage he passed on to a study of the loftier inspiration of the prophets. His *Commentary on the Prophetic Books* (1840-41) is unquestionably his exegetical masterpiece. The subject was congenial. Himself possessed of a real measure of the prophetic spirit, he loved to portray the prophets as men who spoke the truth of God as they felt it in their own hearts and lives. Ever intent on his purpose, he next entered the New Testament field, and wrote a series of books on the Synoptic Gospels, the Johannine literature, and the Epistles of St. Paul, in violent opposition to Strauss and Baur. Meanwhile he had been revising his first crude views on Hexateuchal criticism. Taking up the problem where Eichhorn left it, he carried his principles of analysis right through the Pentateuch and Joshua, assigning the contents of these books to the four sources now generally recognized by Old Testament scholars, though unhappily he insisted on treating the priestly element (P) as the *Urschrift* or 'original document,' belonging to the early years of Solomon's reign, and the more popular Elohistic and Jahwistic narratives (E and J) as mere 'supplements,' ranging from a date soon after Solomon to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century B.C. The pioneer attempt of Vatke in his *Biblical Theology* to relegate the priestly element to the Exile he dismissed with scant courtesy; and the later works of Graf and Kayser in support of this thesis he seems to have passed over in silence. On these foundations, then, Ewald built his imposing *History of Israel* (1843-59). This work is as vast in design as it is massive in structure. It covers, in seven large volumes, the whole period of the history, from its dim beginnings to the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. It has, no doubt, obvious faults. Apart from the insecurity of its foundations, it suffers from a lack of proportion. It is also shot through with diatribes against his enemies, both personal and national. Notwithstanding these defects, it is the work of a great creative spirit. Ewald has an artist's eye for the personalities of the Bible; and he paints them with an artist's brush. Above all, he has a fine sense for the religious significance of the whole. To him the history of Israel is a revelation through men of the mind and will of God, a revelation broadening and deepening to the perfect revelation in Christ.

Of the many distinguished scholars trained in

Ewald's school, Julius Wellhausen was his true spiritual heir. Temperamentally, indeed, the two men were poles apart. Wellhausen was as sober and judicious as Ewald was hot-headed and wilful. The pupil, however, had much of the master's insight, and all of his reverence for the Scriptures as an oracle from the living God. Like Ewald, he prepared himself for his life's work by intensive studies in Arabic and other Semitic languages. He also dug deep in the field of textual criticism. His first important work was his treatise on *The Text of the Books of Samuel* (1869), where the principles of textual criticism were laid down by a firm, sure hand, and Old Testament scholarship was enriched by a series of what Driver calls 'most successful and happy emendations of the text.' Had Wellhausen continued along this line, he would have become our foremost textual critic. His main interest, however, was in the history and religion of Israel. For really constructive work in this sphere he felt he must lay surer foundations than Ewald had done. It was this impulse that led him to his epoch-making studies in Hexateuchal criticism. He was from the first profoundly dissatisfied with Ewald's arrangement of the documents. Learning through Ritschl that Graf placed the Law later than the Prophets, he was prepared to accept the hypothesis, 'almost without his reasons for it,' and boldly struck out in the direction thus suggested. The first-fruits of his labour appeared in the famous articles on *The Composition of the Hexateuch* (1876-77), in which he definitely committed himself to the Grafian 'heresy.' His reason for so doing he stated in succinct form in his revised edition of Bleek's *Introduction* (1878): 'The decision of the question rests on this, that JE knows nothing of unity of worship in Israel, Deuteronomy postulates it as a new institution that had not hitherto existed, while the Priestly Code presupposes it as having existed and been developed to its fullest consequences, as a matter of course, from the very beginning.' The *Prolegomena*, which appeared the same year, confirms this general statement by a broad survey of the literature of the Old Testament. On this basis rests the *History of Israel and Judah* (1894). The book is planned on quite a different scale from Ewald's *History*. While it covers the same range, it contains less than 400 pages. Unencumbered by critical details, it moves easily over the ground, tracing in vivid and often brilliant outlines the political, social, and religious developments of the history. Here, too, the stress is laid on the great spiritual movements and personalities. Among others, the

sections on Amos and Jeremiah, Jewish piety, and the Gospel have become classical.

Apart from his translation of Psalms in the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, and his brief but illuminating *Minor Prophets*, Wellhausen's later work was mainly in the field of Arabic history and religion. His most important contribution to this subject is his small volume entitled *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (1897), a collection and interpretation of the survivals of Arabian paganism, with penetrating applications to religious movements in Israel, the most suggestive part of the volume being his explanation of primitive sacrifice as a rite of 'communion with God'—the theory which is worked out with such a wealth of learning in Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*.

Wellhausen's influence has been profound and far-reaching. For a full generation he dominated the Old Testament scholarship of two continents. In his own land he inspired, more or less directly, the Hexateuchal criticism of Budde, Smend, Holzinger, and especially Eissfeldt, in his recent *Hexateuch-Synopse*; the leading commentaries of the period, such as those of Holzinger on Genesis and Exodus, Steuernagel on Deuteronomy, Budde on Judges and Samuel, Duhm on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Minor Prophets, Marti on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets, Cornill on Jeremiah, Kraetzschmar and Herrmann on Ezekiel, and Nowack on the Minor Prophets; the standard Introductions to the Old Testament of Steuernagel, König, and Cornill; the Histories of Israel by Stade and Guthe; the stimulating studies of the prophets by Duhm and Hölscher; and the constructive expositions of the Religion of Israel by Schultz, Smend, Stade, Bertholet, König, and Kautzsch.

In all Wellhausen's work there is a crystalline clearness and sharpness of edge. One is conscious, however, of a certain lack of atmosphere and background. He approaches his subject from the standpoint of the literary critic, and too often he fails to do justice to the life behind the literature. Moreover, while he has an open eye for the Arabian origin of much of the Israelite tradition, he has little appreciation of the streams of influence that flowed in from surrounding nations, as these are being so copiously revealed by the results of excavation in Palestine and other Oriental countries. In these two respects his work is fittingly complemented by that of the 'historical school.' The first sign of the times was Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1894), which traced the influence of the Babylonian myth of Tiamat all through the Bible. But the most influential pioneering work along the new lines was his great

Commentary on Genesis, the first edition of which was published in 1901. This Commentary is as keenly critical as Wellhausen's *Composition*. The main feature of the work, however, is the attempt to get beyond the literary sources to the popular traditions enshrined in them, and to relate these to the parallel Babylonian, Egyptian, and cognate traditions. The whole treatment, too, is suffused by a richness of colour like that of the dawn, and by a warmth of religious feeling which is as refreshing as it is rare in a critical commentary. The same qualities characterize the *Göttingen Bible*, a work of popular exposition by Gunkel and the leading members of his school. Gunkel's contribution to this series is confined to the exposition of Genesis and introductions to the Greater Prophets. Of recent years he has applied himself with special interest to the prophetic and poetical books of the Old Testament, his latest achievement being his *Commentary on the Psalms* (1926), which is still richer in spiritual sympathy than his *Genesis*. Here also his aim is to trace the literary products to their origin in the spoken and sung word, and to set the whole in the context of contemporary Oriental civilization. He is thus able to assign considerable portions of the prophetic literature, and many of the Psalms, to an earlier date than the literary critics had allowed.

The most brilliant of the younger members of the historical school was Hugo Gressmann, whose untimely death in 1927 was an irreparable loss to Old Testament scholarship. Gressmann established his literary fame at an early age by his *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), a bold attempt to show that the prophets of Israel were dominated by eschatological conceptions drawn mainly from Babylonian and Egyptian mythology—a theory which enjoyed some vogue for a decade or two, but is now yielding before the advance of the psychological method of approach to the problem of prophecy. A work of more permanent value is the *Altorientalischen Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* (1909), an exhaustive collection, edited by Gressmann, Ungnad, and Ranke, of Babylonian, Egyptian, and other literary and artistic parallels to the Old Testament. This was followed by *Mose und seine Zeit* (1913), a critical

analysis and reconstruction, on the lines laid down by Gunkel, of the Biblical traditions of Moses' life and work. Gressmann also contributed to the *Göttingen Bible* the sections on the early history of Israel and the beginnings of prophecy, besides publishing a variety of *brochures* and articles in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* and elsewhere on problems of Old Testament history and religion in the light of archæological discoveries in the East. These *brochures* and articles show an amazing range of scholarship, combined with a no less amazing fertility in suggestion.

In researches of this nature there is necessarily a large subjective element. There is also the danger of obscuring the distinctive genius of the Bible. It was with pleasure, therefore, that one read in the Prospectus issued by Hempel, on taking over from Gressmann the editorship of the *Z.A.T.W.*, his appeal for a more positive treatment of the religion of Israel. This appeal was, as it were, answered in advance by Eissfeldt's article in the Journal for 1926 on 'The History of the Religion of Israel and Judah, and Old Testament Theology.' In this article Eissfeldt, who is perhaps the most acute literary critic since Wellhausen, insists in the first place on the legitimacy of the historical method. Only through this method can we understand the progress of spiritual life in Israel. But knowledge of the historical movement can never lead us beyond the sphere of the 'relative and immanent.' To appreciate the 'absolute and transcendent' worth of the Bible, we must read it by the eyes of faith as a revelation of eternal truth and life. Knowledge and faith are complementary. Faith inspires knowledge; at the same time knowledge clarifies and enriches faith. For an adequate interpretation of the Bible, therefore, the two must go hand in hand. Though they may be like parallel planes, which meet only in the Infinite, yet they can be united in one person, and thus form a spiritual harmony in the finite.

The appearance of an article like this encourages one to hope that from among the younger Old Testament scholars in Germany there may arise a second Eichhorn, who shall point the way to the Highest Criticism—that of spirit and truth.

Literature.

CHRISTOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

THE third volume of the late Professor B. B. Warfield's contributions to theological thought is an important work entitled *Christology and Criticism* (Milford; 15s. net). It consists of a series of extended articles contributed to the American and British learned Press during the years 1906 to 1916. The book is a masterly summary of the critical discussions of the period, including the Messianic Hope, the Sinlessness of Jesus, P. W. Schmiedel's famous 'pillar-passages,' the doctrine of the Two Natures, A. Drews' 'The Christ Myth,' the place of the historical element in Christianity, and the Virgin Birth. All these essays are marked by the keen insight, wide knowledge, and pungent style, which characterized Dr. Warfield's writings during his long tenure of office as Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology at Princeton, New Jersey. The point of view is definitely conservative, but the book is essentially one for the modern student to read. On the one hand, he will certainly be led to take off his hat to the learning and resource of the former giants of orthodoxy, and on the other hand, he will reap the priceless advantage of seeing what modern theories look like when they are seen through the eyes of a great conservative.

The opening essay on 'The Divine Messiah in the Old Testament' shows how closely Dr. Warfield had followed continental discussions regarding Ps 45⁶ ('Thy throne, O God'), Is 9⁶ ('Mighty God'), and Dn 7^{13f}. ('One like unto a son of man'). His claim is that 'it has again been made plain that the Messianic hope was aboriginal in Israel, and formed, indeed, in all ages the heart of Israelitish religion' (p. 38 f.). The article on 'Jesus' Alleged Confession of Sin' gives a remarkably full account of the opinions which have been held regarding the question, 'Why callest thou me good?' and a valuable long note is appended in repudiation of the contention of F. C. Conybeare that the original Markan reading was 'Call me not good.' Dr. Warfield's denial that the question implies a consciousness of sin is very forcibly argued, but this cannot be said of his explanation of the Matthaean variant. His claim is that the two Evangelists report 'different fragments of the conversation.' The seventy-five pages devoted to Schmiedel's 'pillar-passages' are trenchant to a degree, and

culminate in the statement that 'if the supernatural Jesus is to be displaced from history, it is not on historical grounds that He can be displaced' (p. 255).

In the two articles on 'The "Two Natures" and Recent Christological Speculation,' Dr. Warfield attacks the attempts of J. Weiss and others to find a 'more primitive' view of the Person of Christ. He holds that there is no Christian literature in existence which does not base itself on the doctrine of the Two Natures, and that the only alternative is that of a Jesus who is either mythical or self-deceived. This issue is taken up again in a brilliant chapter on 'Christless Christianity' in which Dr. Warfield, with evident relish, describes the dismay with which the 'liberal' theologians confronted the publication of Arthur Drews' book, 'The Christ Myth,' in 1909. The article broadens out into a masterly treatment of the various attempts which have been made to depreciate the importance of the historical element in Christianity, and which so often draw their inspiration from the famous declaration of Lessing that 'accidental truths of history can never be the proof of necessary truths of reason.' Dr. Warfield traces the source of these views to a depreciation of the Person of Jesus. 'Whenever Jesus is reduced in His Person or work to the level of His "followers," His indispensableness is already in principle subverted, and the seeds of a Christless Christianity are planted' (p. 359).

The essay on 'The Essence of Christianity and the Cross of Christ' examines the critical views of Wrede, Loisy, and others of like mind. Here the argumentative thrusts are deadly. Thus, in speaking of the habit of describing Paul as 'the second founder' of Christianity, Dr. Warfield quietly remarks that one great difficulty 'arises from Paul's vigorous repudiation of the honour thrust upon him.' More merciless still is his reply to one scholar who confesses that he could not be a Christian if Christianity really were a religion of expiation. 'It is a sad confession, but by no means an unexampled one. Every Inquiry Room supplies its contingent of like instances.' But the argument is not merely a flashing of rapiers. Sound historical judgment is shown in the observation that 'Liberal Christianity' 'can live only as a kind of parasitical growth upon some sturdier stock,' while 'those who share the great experience of

reconciliation with God . . . know themselves to be instinct with a life peculiar to themselves and cannot help forming a community, distinguished from all others by this common great experience' (p. 444).

The book is a powerful piece of writing. Its defect is the reverse side of its strong qualities. The skilful manner in which one critic is played off against another adds a note of piquancy, but conceals many real difficulties with which the critics deal. It is clear that Dr. Warfield had little use for criticism; he even refuses to look upon Mark as 'the primitive Gospel'; but, both as a landmark, and a defence of historical Christianity, his book is of very great value, and the intention to publish his contributions by the Oxford University Press is heartily to be welcomed.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

Judging by the production of books on the subject, the problems of Christian Reunion are occupying many minds. Two new books are before us dealing in very different ways with the problem.

In *Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., sets out in very courteous fashion what we may call the minimum required by Catholics in any possible scheme for the ecclesiastical reunion of Christendom. It can do nothing but good to have this point of view thus honestly and frankly set forth; but the impression left on our mind is that the ideal aimed at is not likely to be realized for some considerable time. One of the most interesting sections of the book is a postscript in which Canon Streeter's views of the primitive Church are criticised.

Quite different is *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, by Mr. H. Richard Niebuhr, Ph.D. (Holt, New York; \$2.50). This is a work which deserves wide publicity and careful consideration. The author's main thesis is that it is a total mistake to regard ecclesiastical divisions as due solely to theological or ritualistic differences of opinion. For the existence of denominations many factors—political, social, economic—have to be taken into account. Denominations, in fact, are largely due to the 'secularization' of the Church; the tragic feature of whose history has been that the very body designed to afford a meeting-place for every one, in which all social and other distinctions were to be overcome, has herself become divided, and a new source of divisions among men. This theme is

illustrated in striking fashion by a review of Denominationalism at various periods and in various lands. The author's hope for the future lies in the possibility of the Churches going back to their primitive aim to be societies bound together by love, and radiating a spirit of love and brotherhood.

XAVIER.

Mrs. Robertson, of Aberdeen, has written with vivid and arresting power the story of *Francis Xavier, Knight Errant of the Cross* (S.C.M.; 5s. net). She traces his career from his birth in 1506 in the lordly Spanish home among the mountains, through his eleven years of university life in Paris, and on through his early experiences of ministering for Christ by word and deed in Italy; then she graphically describes the hardships of the voyage from Lisbon to India, and his multitudinous missionary labours first in India and later in Japan. But, fascinating as all this is—and not least the incidental description of medieval university life—Mrs. Robertson stirs our interest even more deeply by her portrayal of the spiritual influences which made Francis Xavier the man he came to be. Chief among these was the powerful—if in some ways also baleful—influence of Ignatius Loyola. The interaction of these two strong souls makes a fine psychological study. Figures of great historical importance in the history of the Church and of religion, such as Calvin, Erasmus, George Buchanan, flit across these pages. At one time Francis' sympathies, it seems, lay with the Lutherans, and Mrs. Robertson raises the interesting question of what course the career of Francis might have taken, had these sympathies been permitted to develop, as they probably would have done but for the influence of Loyola. With such a devoted disciple as Francis Xavier, the Jesuit Order certainly got a good start. Incidentally, Mrs. Robertson lets us see how readily legends grow round a commanding personality, and how easily miraculous traits emerge. Xavier was, doubtless, a fine linguist, but his own confessions are enough to disprove, if disproof were needed, the miraculous power with which he has been credited of speaking in the language of whatever person he happened to address.

By her graphic and graceful narrative, Mrs. Robertson easily holds our attention from the beginning to the end, and leaves upon our mind the clear impression that she has been telling the story not only of a great and devoted missionary, but of a truly great man.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

The late Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, formerly Professor of Systematic Theology, Wycliffe College, Toronto, and sometime Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, completed some ten or fifteen years ago a great work on the Anglican Articles. It has now been published just as it was prepared for the press by the learned and scholarly author, except for a few verbal alterations and a few additions to the Bibliography. The title is *The Principles of Theology* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net), and the subtitle, 'An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles.' The work takes its place in a not over-crowded field as one marked both by careful historical scholarship and by fidelity to the Articles as containing the essential Anglican Doctrine.

In certain quarters the Articles are in disfavour. That they are too Calvinistic is a common objection. And the Prayer Book is regarded as a truer source for the principles of Anglican Theology. But Dr. Griffith Thomas holds that there is no essential difference between the Prayer Book and the Articles, both of which came almost entirely from Cranmer. The only difference between them is that between a formulary of devotion and a standard of belief; so that whereas all that is required concerning the Prayer Book is a declaration of belief that there is nothing in it contrary to Scripture, in regard to the Articles a declaration is required that they are the standard of faith and the test of orthodoxy.

As for the objection to the Articles as too Calvinistic, it is allowed that the Lutheran Confessions, more especially those of Augsburg and Württemberg, were of more importance for the Church of England than the 'Reformed' Confessions. On the other hand, there was an essential harmony of doctrine among the Reformers amid many details that varied. Expressions on a doctrine like Predestination differ, but 'the difference is one of degree rather than of kind.' Moreover, 'there is nothing more striking than the fact that while our Articles are often verbally identical with those of Augsburg, their doctrine of the Sacraments is, and always has been, of the "Reformed," not the Lutheran type.'

Dr. Griffith Thomas would, no doubt, have had more things to say on the doctrine of the Sacraments had he written in full view of the Prayer Book Controversy, but we may take it that nothing would have shaken his opinion on Pitt's often quoted words that the Church of England has a Popish Liturgy, an Arminian clergy, and Cal-

vinistic Articles. He regarded the falsity of the statement as only matched by its cleverness.

A brief history and analysis of the Articles leads to their exposition in detail under the successive headings of the Substance of Faith (I.-V.), the Rule of Faith (VI.-VIII.), the Life of Faith (IX.-XVIII.), and the Household of Faith (XIX.-XXXIX.). The conclusion touches on such questions as the permanent value of the Articles and the ethics of subscription to Creeds and Articles; and here as in the historical discussions of the volume the author quotes freely from Professor Curtis's 'History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith,' a work to which he also pays a handsome tribute.

It may be that our age is not interested in dogmatic theology, especially of the Confessional type here represented, with its appeal to Scriptural authority. But Dr. Griffith Thomas was no reactionary theologian, and his pages testify that he did feel the movement of modern theology; and they will be welcomed by many Anglican Churchmen who believe with the writer of the Foreword to this volume that 'the Thirty-Nine Articles still stand, not only as a great monument of the victories of the Reformation, but as an ever-steadfast bulwark of the true principles of the Church of England.'

PROFESSOR MACKINNON'S 'LUTHER.'

The fourth and final volume of Professor James Mackinnon's work, *Luther and the Reformation* (Longmans; 16s. net), is now before us. We desire to congratulate the scholarly author on the accomplishment of his task. The preceding instalments have been noted as they appeared; and all we said of them applies to this, which covers the period from the Augsburg Confession to Luther's death. Professor Mackinnon has had before him, as he explains in the preface to this volume, a strictly limited purpose. He has written not a history of the Reformation, nor a life of all its leaders, but just—Luther and the Reformation. His work is one of which Scotland may well be proud. It is not a mere compilation drawn from the vast stores of recent studies of Luther. The author has himself gone to the sources and written down his own direct impressions of the great figure whom he has, through that patient, laborious study of his writings, come to know and esteem. We receive with gratitude this massive work, the fruit of untiring research and prolonged thought. The closing chapters give a well-balanced estimate of Luther

and his achievement. The former had his faults, and the latter its serious limitations; but both stand out by sheer merit and have had a permanent influence on human progress.

MYSTICISM.

Professor Rufus M. Jones renders a good service to students of Mysticism by his biographical and critical sketches of the careers of some of the mystics, ancient, mediæval, and modern, which form the chapters of his latest book, *Some Exponents of Mystical Religion* (Epworth Press; 6s. net). After an introductory discussion of the mystic's experience, he deals in succession with Plotinus, Meister Eckhart, Browning, and Walt Whitman, with a chapter on the Influence of the Mystics on Luther, and another on Mystical Life and Thought in America. Discussions of mysticism often lead the ordinary non-mystical reader nowhere, but Dr. Jones succeeds in making this aspect of religious experience as intelligible as perhaps it can be made. Plotinus he regards as 'the most worth knowing of the entire list of thinkers between Aristotle and Kant,' while Eckhart, in the fourteenth century, is 'the culmination of neoplatonized Christian mysticism.' He makes the point, also made by Miss Underhill in her book on 'The Church and the Mystics,' that the mystics were often eminently practical people: much of Eckhart's life, he points out, was spent in administration, and 'he was as strong in practical activity as in quiet contemplation.' Though Luther was neither temperamentally nor constitutionally a mystic, Dr. Jones suggests that his study of the mystics was the turning-point in his life. Browning, despite the critical quality of his mind, was yet 'in the truest and best sense of the word a mystic,' and many apt quotations from his poetry are offered to substantiate this view. Perhaps to most readers the chapter on Walt Whitman, which is also furnished with abundant and appropriate quotations, will make the freshest appeal. In one revealing page Dr. Jones lets us see his own conception of mysticism. 'Most,' he says, 'of what Herrmann'—who was no friend of mysticism—'means by the experience of communion is what I mean by mysticism.' To this intelligible sort of mysticism few readers will object. This pleasant book, with its appeal to modern poetry as well as to ancient philosophy, brings an abstruse subject within the comprehension of all students of religious experience.

A great many people in Britain as well as America will hail with pleasure a book on China which will tell them both the origin of the troubles in that distracted land, and the real situation of matters there at present. Such a book is here in *China's Revolution from the Inside*, by R. Y. Lo, Ph.D. (Abingdon Press; \$2.00). Dr. Lo possesses the requisite knowledge; he is an ardent patriot, a leading Christian, and a convinced Nationalist. In a long introductory chapter he tells the complicated story of China's many internal conflicts since 1915. He is convinced that the present Nationalist régime holds the prospect of a lasting and just government. But there are endless conflicting currents, and in chapter after chapter he traces the source and influence of these. His last chapter on 'The Christian Movement' is most enlightening. He is optimistic about the prospects of the Christian Church, but he has very frank and searching words to say about the part Western powers have played in China's affairs. Decidedly this is a book to read.

'We do not think it possible to solve the problems of society unless a much greater number of people are trained to the practice of fellowship . . . the recovery of Christendom will come, not by the formation of a new party, but by the miracle of fellowship.' These two sentences are the pith of a remarkable book which is itself the fruit of much labour and thought on the part of various fellowships. It may be said to have begun in the Free Church Fellowship about 1926. The need for research and experiment brought in Copec, the Industrial Christian Fellowship, the Anglican Fellowship, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, as well as a host of other little companies. Slowly, and through several recensions, the book, criticised and remoulded, cut down and enlarged, gradually took shape, until the present form was reached. While the sentences quoted above are the burden of it all, fellowship is expounded and commended on all its sides: its relation to the individual, to social progress, to the Church; its value for thought and faith and practice. Group life is set forth as the way to real results. Seeing that so many hands have been at work, the book is a wonderful performance, and especially manifests an amazing unity, which shows how deeply sympathetic the minds of its authors and abettors have been. It is a pleasure to say a word in praise of such sound work as this, and to urge its perusal by all who have at heart the applications of Christian truth to the problems of our distracted

time. The title of the volume is *Fellowship Principles and Practice*, by a Fellowship Group, edited by Malcolm Spencer and H. S. Hewish (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net).

The Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture, which was founded in 1917, was last year delivered by Mr. C. G. Montefiore, D.D., D.Litt., who chose as his subject *IV. Ezra* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. cloth, 1s. paper). He makes this apocalyptic book, however, little more than the starting-point for a long and interesting discussion of Universalism, a belief to which many influences contributed—the conquests of Assyria and later of Alexander the Great, Stoic philosophy, Roman Law, and certain aspects of Old Testament and New Testament thought. The sinister influence of Augustine is noted, with his ominous interpretation of ‘Compel them to come in,’ which bore such terrible fruit in the persecutions of the Middle Ages. Dr. Montefiore has an eminently just mind, and his comments on all themes, be they Jewish or Christian, are entirely devoid of bias. His conclusions may be summarily presented thus: ‘that “the sinners of all creeds and nations” shall at last be purified and admitted to the eternal beatitudes is,’ he thinks, ‘winning its way to becoming an accepted doctrine of every shade and variety of Judaism,’ while ‘we may say that Universalism is tending to triumph’ also ‘all along the Christian line.’ If there are Christians who might demur to this, there are none who would not be edified by this informing and impartial sketch of the historical development of the doctrine.

Eschatological students will be interested in *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life* (vol. xi. of the Indo-Iranian Series, Columbia University Press; \$3.00 net), by Dr. Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry, sometime Lecturer in Indo-Iranian Languages at Columbia. The volume, which is the second edition, has been enriched with some new material in the footnotes. The author, who is already known for his recently published work on Zoroastrian Sacraments and Ceremonies, gives us a presentation and discussion of the statements contained in the *Gāthās*, the later *Avesta*, the Pahlavi writings, and the Parsi-Persian literature, with reference to the experience of the righteous and the wicked after death, the manifestation of Conscience, the Individual Judgment, and the crossing of the Chinvat Bridge. He has collected and co-ordinated all the material based on the most recent Iranian research, and has developed certain

additional aspects in the light of modern Parsi beliefs, with which Western scholars may not be acquainted. It would have been interesting to have the views of such a capable Parsi scholar on the resemblances that exist between the eschatological ideas in Zoroastrianism and those of older faiths, notably Judaism and Christianity. The author, however, has thought it best not to deal with this subject, though he has pointed out certain parallels to be found in Manichæism. Nevertheless, the book is interesting and valuable as containing, in the latest form, the teachings of Zoroastrianism on the future life, and Bible students may themselves compare these with the Biblical ideas. There is a widely held opinion that Zoroastrian beliefs profoundly affected the most important later developments of Judaism, especially in regard to Angelology, Demonology, and the doctrine of the Resurrection. Whether this be so or not, there can be little doubt that Zoroastrianism is much nearer to Judaism than any other religion can pretend to be, and that its influence must have been antecedently felt. On this account alone, Dr. Pavry's volume should prove of much use to Biblical students.

Of the small band of scholars competent to quarry in the Talmud, the band is smaller still that can bring to the investigation of Talmudic law minds trained in the general study of law. To this small band belongs Mr. Moses Jung, LL.B., Ph.D., who devotes a volume of one hundred and forty-five pages to *The Jewish Law of Theft*, with comparative references to Roman and English Law (Dropsie College, Philadelphia; \$2.00). Every aspect of this intricate subject is carefully dealt with—the guilty mind, the guilty act, what constitutes ownership, non-technical thefts, restitution, etc. Dr. Jung seems justified in believing that ‘the place accorded to the Jewish law in the legal science of to-day will grow in importance, in proportion to the discovery of its historic uniqueness.’ By the wide dispersion of the Jewish people, Jewish Law has been brought into contact with the laws of Babylonians, Hittites, Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, and practically all modern civilized peoples, and in one way or another it has been affected by all these codes, and it has in its turn profoundly affected some of them. In its repudiation of the extreme form of the *lex talionis*, its refusal to expose deformed children, its repudiation of cruel punishments, and in numerous other ways, it has exhibited a rare and exemplary humanity; and Israel's juristic experiences may justly be re-

garded as 'a part of universal history that has a value and meaning for the world.' This claim is amply borne out by the subtle discussions of this book, which will be welcomed by the student not only of law, but of human society.

The Rev. William E. Bromilow, D.D., is a native of Australia, a member of the Wesleyan Church in that Dominion, who received the honorary D.D. degree from Aberdeen University in recognition of his notable work as a missionary pioneer in the British part of Papua or New Guinea. He has now written the story of his extraordinary experiences and their wonderful results among a savage race of head-hunters and cannibals under the title *Twenty Years among Primitive Papuans* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). It was in 1891, three years after Papua had been annexed to the British Crown, that, in response to an appeal of Sir William Macgregor the first administrator, Dr. Bromilow, his wife and daughter and several other missionaries representing the Wesleyan Church, left Sydney for their allotted post on the small island of Dobu. This was chosen for the headquarters of the mission not only because of its central position, but also because the Dobuans by their fierce blood-thirstiness 'offered a test case for missionary work.' Sir William Macgregor described the Papuans as about the worst cannibals he knew in New Guinea, which next to Australia is the largest island continent in the world. But just six years after the landing of the mission when he again visited Dobu, he was amazed to be received by sixty native students. Moreover, the Governor was struck with the fact that the natives had quite a different expression on their faces. After sixteen years of self-denying labour among this primitive people, Dr. and Mrs. Bromilow because of impaired health had to return to Australia. But on the outbreak of the Great War, when the mission was threatened with collapse, they consented to return and continue their labours for another four years. In his retirement Dr. Bromilow completed a translation of the Scriptures into Dobuan. He is able also to rejoice in his successor's magnificent work—the great Training College at Salamo on Ferguson Island where scholastic, technical, medical, agricultural, domestic and other courses are provided. Thinking of the condition that confronted him and his colleagues in face of the cannibals of 1891, and reading of the girls' school and training college of 1926, Dr. Bromilow can say with the Psalmist 'we were like them that dream.'

Some twenty years ago lovers of Browning were

interested in the appearance of a new expositor of the poet in the person of a Glasgow minister. His 'Guidance from Robert Browning in Matters of Faith' was, if we are not mistaken, the fruit of popular lectures to a week-day class. They obtained a considerable popularity in published form. The minister has since become known to a large public as the editor of 'The British Weekly,' and he has now issued a companion volume under the title *Further Guidance from Robert Browning in Matters of Faith* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net). The new book will probably obtain at least as wide a circulation as the old. It has all the writer's familiar charm of thought and language, with his freshness of mind and engaging familiarity. The book is suitably an exposition of 'Ferishtah's Fancies,' and will reward readers of literary and theological proclivities alike.

The author of 'The Christ of the Indian Road,' and 'Christ at the Round Table,' is safe in counting on a cordial reception for anything he chooses to say about religion. In his latest book, *The Christ of Every Road* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), as the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost is drawing nigh, he has chosen to speak about Pentecost. All the chapters of this book are written round some aspect of that epoch-making experience. The modern world is perplexed, and the modern Church, Mr. Stanley Jones believes, is 'largely unready for this year'; she knows much, but she does not know how to live abundantly. What she needs is just such an experience of the Spirit as came at Pentecost, and the book shows what the effects of such a visitation would be and how it would cut across many of the conventions and practices of our personal and ecclesiastical life. One or two references to the Lausanne Conference (pp. 40, 119) suggest that Mr. Jones is not very confident that along that route lie the things that concern our peace: it is 'a Conference largely in the hands of the old and looking to precedent rather than progress.' The book, which is profusely illustrated with apt anecdote, is aglow with devotion to Christ. The Christ for whom he pleads is 'the Christ of Every Road, especially the Christ of those Inner Roads of Personal Life and Experience.'

Widely as Professor Leonard Hodgson and Mr. Stanley Jones would differ on many points, they would probably agree in this that, 'whatever may have been the exact form of the outward events of the first Whitsun Day, there can be little doubt of its inward meaning. Those two words, insight

and initiative, give the clue.' These words are taken from the chapter on 'Sacraments' in Dr. Hodgson's *Essays in Christian Philosophy* (Longmans; 9s. net). The charm of this book is its combination of the theoretical and the practical. Well aware of the close connexion between ethics and metaphysics, the writer in the earlier chapters discusses such subjects as 'The Self and "The Unconscious,"' and at very considerable length, the question of 'Freedom.' Then he embarks on problems of urgent practical importance, such as Authority, the Sacraments, the Reunion of Christendom, and he has even ventured to discuss the problem, which bulks so largely in popular and professional discussion to-day, of Birth Control.

The book is a thoughtful exposition of Christian principle in its practical application; it is inspired throughout by the faith that 'the one and only purpose of life in the flesh is the winning of goodness through the exercise of freedom.' This quest demands a helpful environment, and it is there that the sacraments of the Church come to our aid. But they do not operate magically. The sacramental life is enriched not by the study of sacramental doctrine but by the study of the character of Christ. A fine sanity and generosity characterize all the discussions. The author, who was born and bred in the traditions of the Oxford Movement, makes no attempt to conceal his ecclesiastical preferences, or his belief that the only kind of Church order reasonably likely to meet the requirements of inter-communion is the historic order of the threefold ministry; but he frankly admits that persons who differ in their views as to the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist may yet kneel side by side and hold communion with Him; for what matters is not how He comes, but who He is. If the discussions occasionally seem inconclusive to men of a dogmatic temper, it is because the writer wisely recognizes that discussion does not necessarily issue in 'the solution of our difficulties, but in the discovery of where the true difficulties lie.' The book makes much stiffer reading than Mr. Stanley Jones's, but there is in it the same glow of devotion to Christ, and the same ardent desire to see the mind of Christ operative in those who are called by His name.

In recent times there has been a considerable revival of interest in the great Scholastics. Those who are interested in the religious philosophy of Thomas Aquinas may be recommended to consult *The Desire of God in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, by Mr. James E. O'Mahony, O.S.F.C.,

M.A., Ph.D. (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net). It is as lucid as the very abstruse questions dealt with permit; and will convince the reader of the massive intellectual ability of the learned Saint.

Every year the Bishop of London commends a book for Lenten reading. The one this year is *Be of Good Cheer* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), and the author, the Reverend W. P. G. McCormick, Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. 'I am glad he has chosen the subject of "Joy,"' the Bishop says, 'as joy is the one note most wanted in our religion to-day.' The book is intended, not for the scholar, but for ordinary men and women, and it has a large prepared public in those who listen eagerly to the Rev. 'Pat' McCormick's talks on the wireless. The sermon given this month for the Third Sunday after Easter is taken from one of the chapters, and shows well the scope and sincerity of the book.

Mr. Duncan Macnaughton presents *A Scheme of Babylonian Chronology from the Flood to the Fall of Nineveh*, with notes thereon, including notes on Egyptian and Biblical Chronology (Luzac; 7s. 6d.). Obviously an enormous amount of investigation and a special study of ancient astronomy have gone to the making of this book, which traces in chronological detail the monarchs of Babylon and Egypt, and the leaders of Israel from Abraham to David. Here are a few of the more important conclusions: Naram Sin 2814-2777, Hammurabi 2406-2363, Akhenaten 1501-1489, Tutankhamen 1480-1468, Rameses II. 1417-1351, Abraham (who, it is argued, was not contemporary with Hammurabi) born 2275, the Exodus 1555, while 'the total period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple works out at 582 years,' not 480, as in 1 K 6¹. Mr. Macnaughton, who claims to 'have no established reputation as a chronologist to uphold,' deserves credit for having gone his own way. It is interesting to learn that the Flood began on 8th January (Julian) 3189 B.C. This is accuracy indeed.

Like every good student of great literature, Professor W. G. Jordan, D.D., of Kingston, Ontario, Canada, who, by his 'Prophetic Ideas and Ideals,' 'Religion in Song,' and many other volumes, has put lovers of the Old Testament in his debt, has felt the fascination of the Book of Job, and he has given a fresh and attractive treatment of it in *The Book of Job: Its Substance and Spirit* (Macmillan; \$2.00). In successive sections he dis-

cusses the need of criticism, the nature of Hebrew poetry, the unsolved problems of the book and its interpretation, its place in Hebrew literature, the book as a work of art, its spiritual significance, Job's position as a sufferer, and the passages such as the Elihu speeches and the descriptions of behemoth and leviathan, which Dr. Jordan, in common with most scholars, regards as later additions to the book. Wisely refusing to be content merely to discuss the book, he presents it, or at least its more salient passages, in Professor Tayler Lewis's translation, which he has interspersed with valuable comments that reveal the consecution of the argument. Many suggestive thoughts are scattered up and down the discussion, e.g. the contrast between the reverent wonder at the contemplation of the universe and its processes in chs. 38 f. and the weariness reflected in Ec 1⁴⁻⁹. He also rightly calls attention to the importance of Elihu, for whether his speeches be original to the book or not, 'he no doubt represented a real current of thought and feeling in his day.' Dr. Jordan is at his best in discussing the spiritual significance of the book. In the great speech of the Almighty (38 f.) we feel, as he finely says, 'the fresh breezes, and realize that out in the wider spaces of God's world there is something that rebukes our impatience and our pride.' This study helps us to feel afresh the depth and power of that immortal book.

Mr. Frank E. Gaebelein, A.M., has written a book entitled *Exploring the Bible* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 5s. net) with the laudable desire of commending the Bible more particularly to youth, 'those in the upper grades of high school or the first years of college.' We very much fear that the kind of approach suggested here is much more likely to deter than to attract modern youth to the study of Biblical literature. With very slight occasional concessions to the modern position, the book stands rooted in antiquated conceptions which are disowned by practically all competent Biblical scholarship to-day, such as that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and Solomon Ecclesiastes; the Trinity is suggested in Gn 1²⁶, David wrote Ps 22, Malachi's 'Sun' (capital S!) 'of righteousness' is a Messianic allusion to Jesus—and so on. Our course through the Bible is steered by guidance on the 'seven dispensations' and the 'eight major covenants,' and 'Biblical structure is at bottom mathematical.' It is really too late in the day to treat the Bible in this mechanical fashion. The inherent vitality of the Bible is shown by the fact

that it has survived so many defences and expositions of this kind.

The idea governing *The Epic of the Old Testament*, by Mr. Arthur H. Wood, M.A., Oxon. (Milford; 6s. net), is a good one, and on the whole is well executed. Mr. Wood knows that the Old Testament 'contains some of the best stories, the best poetry, the best drama, and the profoundest thought of any work that the world has yet seen,' and he is anxious that the great host of people to whom the Old Testament is unfamiliar should also taste of this literary pleasure. He has therefore presented selections, to a small extent from the older English Versions but chiefly from the R.V., in chronological continuity, so that, as these selections are both appropriate and numerous, they practically embody the history of the Hebrew people from the patriarchs to the Maccabees. The prophets appear interspersed among the historical books, and their utterances are thus more readily intelligible. The selections are prefaced by brief but valuable introductory notes, and the leading dates are indicated.

Naturally the chapters are mentioned from which the excerpts are taken; but, if the purpose of the book is to encourage the reading of the Old Testament itself, the writer should have indicated the verses as well. This he has occasionally done, e.g. Jer 21¹⁻¹⁰, Ezk 37¹⁻¹⁴, but very frequently excerpts from two or three chapters are run together, e.g. Am 2, 5, 6, and 8, or Hos 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10, with no further indication of their place within these chapters. The combinations, too, are not always happy; it is particularly unfortunate, e.g., that Is 53 and 49⁸⁻¹³ should be strung together—and in this order. Poetry is usually printed as poetry; but in that case Dt 33^{13ff.} should have received poetic form, and the poetic form of the Song of Deborah should have been more distinctly recognized. Mr. Wood knows that 'recent research gives the date of the fall of Nineveh' as 612 B.C. (p. 220); would it not have been well in that case to substitute this date for 607 on pp. xiv and 95? Again, the Song of Deborah, which is in the Book of Judges, can hardly belong to the *Hexateuch* (p. 217). Within two pages (97-99) Habakkuk is spelt twice correctly and twice wrongly (as Habbakuk). On p. 169 we are told that Antiochus iv. 'named himself Epiphanes, the Brilliant.' Driver, however (*Daniel*, p. xxxviii), remarks, 'This title does not mean "illustrious," but "manifest," and implies that the bearer of it claimed to be a visible god.' But these points do not detract from the

excellence of the book. The work as a whole, with its wisely chosen selections, is well fitted to encourage interest in the great and greatly neglected literature of the Old Testament.

Professor George A. Barton, of the University of Pennsylvania, has given us a most valuable book, begun twelve years ago, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad* (Milford ; 28s. net), forming the first volume of the 'Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions.' The book contains a transliteration and translation of all the royal inscriptions that were written in Sumerian and Akkadian anterior to the First Dynasty of Babylon. It thus gives us the earliest historical records from ancient Babylonia, a country that contests with Egypt the earliest civilization in the world. With the exception of a few texts in ancient Elamitic, these records constitute our only source of information for the history of ancient Babylonia and contiguous countries, and are thus of the highest importance. If the volume be compared with Thureau-Dangin's 'Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königinschriften,' the large number of new texts discovered within the last twenty years will be apparent. As excavations have so far only been made at a few of the sites where monarchs reigned, the number of texts given by Professor Barton must still be only a small fraction of what may yet be recovered. Nevertheless, these give us an interesting picture, though necessarily incomplete, of the life of the country. As might be expected, they are saturated with religious ideas, and record many religious customs. Many of them deal with the building of temples and the presentation of votive offerings. In those from Urukagina we have an account of a great social and religious reform, while in the cylinder inscriptions of Gudea we are taken into the mysteries of inspired visions, the ways of the gods, and the mystic connexion between the gods and Nature. As a source of information regarding the Sumerian religion, these royal inscriptions are quite as important as the liturgies and hymns. Professor Barton provides the reader with an interesting introduction, and there are separate indexes of the Deities, Temples and Buildings, Places and Personal Names. He has done a real service to early Babylonian history in supplying us with these records, and no Old Testament student can afford to dispense with the volume.

Why Preach Christ? by the Rev. Professor G. A. Johnston Ross, D.D. (Milford ; 7s. net), is designated 'a plea for the holy ministry,' and a

most powerful plea it is. Lectures on preaching have been multiplied till preachers are surfeited. Everything seems to have been said that can be said, and it is of little moment who is next chosen to say it over again. But here we have something different, something far more profound. Professor Johnston Ross has set himself to make clear what preaching Christ in its fullness means and what a glorious life-task it is. This theme he has treated with a fine ripeness of scholarship and a rare maturity of wisdom. The reader feels that here is a man who has pondered long and deeply, and now that he speaks every word is worth listening to. In five great chapters full of compressed and profoundly Christian thought he shows, first, the necessity of a Divine personality to whom man's faith may attach itself ; second, how Jesus functions in religion as a truly historic figure and bringer of God to men ; third, what are the distinctive qualities of the Christian life, a life based on a sense of infinite obligation to God and issuing in 'a holy moral anarchy, that transcends all statute and is love pouring itself forth in zealous and happy torrent' ; fourth, the indispensable place of the Church as performing certain essential functions for the Kingdom of God ; and finally, the duty of aiding in the world mission of Jesus. This last chapter in particular is one of the most impressive arguments we have read in support of missionary enterprise in the light of the world situation of to-day. The writer's aim throughout has been to leave in young and generous minds the impression that in the Christian ministry can be found a task fitted to exercise a man's fullest powers and worthy of the devotion of a lifetime.

In *The Psalms, Book III.* (Milford ; 1s. net), which covers Pss 73 to 89, the Rev. F. H. Wales, B.D., pursues his good work of retranslating the Psalms with the minimum of disturbance to the familiar English versions and the maximum of attention to the ultimate textual facts, so far as these can now be ascertained. That he has not gone out of his way to startle the average reader is shown by his conservative rendering of 73^{24b}, '(Thou wilt) afterwards to glory take me' (but why this relatively unmusical order of words ?). Important and practically certain corrections, sometimes resting on the LXX, are unostentatiously made : for example, 84^{7b}, 'they see the God of gods in Zion' ; 85^{8e}, 'to his saints, and to them that turn their hearts to him.' The translation combines dignity, accuracy, and approximation to our familiar versions in a remarkable degree.

For those who cannot afford that admirable classic, Sir George Adam Smith's 'Historical Geography of the Holy Land,' a more than tolerable substitute will be found in Mgr. Legendre's *The Cradle of the Bible* (Sands ; 3s. 6d. net), one of the volumes in 'The Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge,' which we can well believe represents 'the final fruit of half a century's toil.' It is very clearly arranged. The first section, on Western Palestine, discusses in successive chapters the Mediterranean coast, the coastal plain, the mountains of Galilee, the plain of Esdraelon, the mountains of Samaria, the mountains of Judea, the Desert, and the Negeb. The second section, 'the Central Depression,' deals with the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea, the third with Transjordan, while the fourth discusses the geological structure of the country, its temperature, winds, flora, fauna, etc. Though the book is full of information, it is not overloaded, and it can be read with ease and pleasure, for its style is lucid and it has been admirably translated into an English idiom which at no point suggests the French original by the Dominican Sisters of Portobello Road, London. The writer makes the interesting suggestion that the particularism which characterizes the Jews may be in part due to the sentiment of isolation created by the physiological features of Judea. There are two maps and several plans ; but this book, useful and competent as it is, would have gained immensely in value had it been supplemented by sectional maps on which at least the chief places named were indicated.

Dr. Margaret Smith, who some time ago gave us a fine study of Rābi'a, that arresting figure strangely parallel in some phases of her mind to Santa Teresa, has now launched out on an adventurous voyage upon a wide sea ; and her daring vessel is quite small—*An Introduction to the History of Mysticism* (S.P.C.K. ; 4s. net). Twelve pages give us a clear idea—where lucidity is not easy—of her understanding of that omnibus word, 'Mysticism,' in which so many definitions sit uncomfortably wedged together, and even quarrelling a little. And then a hundred more rush as breathlessly over the earth and through the centuries, to a too sudden stop. It would require an immense mass of detailed knowledge to be fully sufficient at every point of so wide-flung a circle ; and, perhaps, that is hardly present. Nor, except as a mere cataloguing of names to be hunted up and studied elsewhere, is it really helpful to be fobbed off with three and a half lines on St. Francis of

Sales, and three on St. Vincent de Paul, and four on Pascal, and three on Brother Lawrence ! Indeed, Dr. Smith seems to tire a little before her journey's end. At least, under the title *Modern Mysticism* every one since 1566 is jostled together in one short overcrowded chapter. But if the book is read strictly as what it claims to be, it is another striking proof of how widely mysticism has sown itself over the earth.

With the general spirit of *Biblical Archaeology and the Hebrew Vocation*, by the Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., F.R.G.S. (Stock ; 2s. net), we are in thorough sympathy, for the writer shows that one of the incidental results of archæological investigation is to confirm the uniqueness of the Bible ; but he covers so much ground in so few pages that his treatment is necessarily scrappy and disjointed, and there are slips, such as 'Eikhorn,' 'Elephantine,' and 'Bbile' for 'Bible,' which do not tend to beget confidence. The most interesting part of the book is an account of Ur, the home of Abraham, and there are stray quotations from Egyptian literature.

The Bishop of St. Albans, Dr. Michael Furse, has written an attractive and helpful book of reflexions on the Christian faith, *God's Plan* (S.C.M. ; 4s. net). It was done in the first place as a kind of *vade mecum* for scoutmasters to help them in the religious side of their work. In conferences the Bishop found that the three questions that scoutmasters and guiders had to face and answer were : What is God like ? What is my duty to Him ? and How can I do it ? And these are mainly the questions discussed in this book. They lead to chapters on Prayer, on the Church, on Jesus Christ, on Public Worship, and on Service. There is a great deal of wisdom, sanely expressed and very helpful, in these pages, which may be commended to all who have the care of the young in their hands.

History is greatly indebted to specialist studies, and when these are thorough and reliable the student deserves well of the historian who uses his material. A good specimen of this kind of work is *Quakerism and Industry before 1800*, by Isabel Grubb, M.A. (Williams & Norgate ; 8s. 6d. net). The book is a result of a Research Fellowship financed by the Woodbrooke Council. It is well documented, and the writer's extensive knowledge is kept well in hand so that we do really see the wood as well as the trees. The period reviewed was one in which the Christian Church largely failed to realize its corporate social responsibility.

But this charge can not be sustained to anything like the same extent in the case of the Quakers. The Quaker was not at heart an individualist, for his life in the Spirit produced a common outlook, and the characteristics of this outlook were integrity,

benevolence, and a spirit of disinterested public service. This theme is worked out in detail in the volume before us, which is not only instructive but has much of the charm of good biography and good history.

The Words from the Cross.

V. 'I thirst' (John xix. 28).

BY THE REVEREND HUBERT L. SIMPSON, M.A., LONDON.

'AND straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink.' It must have been a relief even to a hardened Roman soldier to be able at last to obey the dictate of compassion. The bystanders had just heard the most awful cry that has ever broken from the lips of tortured humanity, and they could do nothing. That was the cry of the human soul in separation; this betokens the reaction of the human body in its weakness. The darkness is now passing away; the awful horror of sin has swept through the Saviour's soul; and as at the Temptation, after the crisis was over, Jesus suffered hunger, so now He suffers thirst. As once by the well of Sychar it was given to an immoral woman to quench His thirst, so now at the well of salvation a rough soldier ministers to His need.

Two draughts were offered to our Lord upon the Cross. One was the cup of wine drugged with bitter herbs of a narcotic tendency which was given in kindness to condemned malefactors to deaden pain. This soporific our Lord refused. He would not meet the Last Enemy of man with senses stupefied. It was to this high resolve to keep His senses unclouded that we owe the Seven Last Words. His true disciples were the Gifford Lecturer who refused to allow his physical sufferings to be relieved with morphia, in order that with undulled senses he might finish the proclaiming of the creed that had become his by right of conquest, whose last words were an ascription of praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God; and the caretaker of a church building, who, when they were endeavouring to administer spirits during a sudden and severe heart attack, forbade them with the exclamation, 'Na, na! I'll no' gang to my Maker wi' the smell o' drink on my lips.'

The other draught which they offered to the Sufferer on the Cross was undrugged wine, the sour beverage which soldiers drank. This He accepted, as ever holding the mean between indulgence of the body and fanatical refusal. And, by His acceptance of the offering of the nameless soldier who ran to His aid, our Lord has blessed all who have brought succour and relief to the wounded and stricken.

All fiery pangs on battlefields,
On fever beds where sick men toss,
Are in that human cry He yields
To anguish on the Cross.

One is always afraid of being guilty of a morbid pietism in dealing with those last scenes in the life of our Lord. It is a healthy instinct which has been shy of the display of crucifixes and stations of the Cross, and other would-be aids to devotion. Equally out of place is the language which tends to obscure the strong truth of the sufferings of our Lord in a mist of 'Ohs!' and 'Ahs!' There is something tremendously impressive about the simplicity, the anguish, the pathos of those words of helpless dependence, 'I thirst.' Jesus uttered only one cry of physical weakness: but He did utter one. There is something not only utterly sincere and attractive about One who is not ashamed to voice His weakness and His pain, but it gives us the key to His Saviourhood. 'In all their affliction He was afflicted—so He was their Saviour.' You may write books to prove that war is a 'great illusion'; and almost before the book is reviewed the most devastating war in history will have broken out. You may found a religious sect on the pleasing hypothesis that the idea of pain is a delusion, but you will not have much success in preaching or practising it beyond west-

end drawing-rooms. The Cross is an ugly and painful fact, and men would gladly banish it if they could. There are many who say, 'Let us now go even unto Bethlehem.' They are enchanted with a religion which they can take up in their arms and patronize. But what do we read about them at Calvary? 'They stood afar off, beholding that sight.' It has been characteristic of the natural attitude of man all through the ages. The cross of pain and suffering, of loss and sorrow and death, is eternally in our midst. There will always be the need for the sympathetic souls who are ready to run with the sponge rather than to let their hands hang down in useless, hopeless despair or unconcern, saying, 'Let be; let us see whether any supernatural agent will help the sufferer in his hour of need.' The Saviour is the One who can use the great, simple, frank speech of humanity, 'I thirst.' A self-control that is sullen and dogged is not going to help anybody. There is a pride which tries to conceal all its wounds. Thomas was right in his conviction that he would never be quite sure that he had got a hold of his Saviour until he had fingered the wounds. The old nurse of Ulysses found the final proof of her dear master's identity when she discovered the remembered scar on his leg.

Our Lord was surrounded by those who had wronged Him, and mocked at His sufferings. He might well have resolved not to let a groan escape His lips, not on any account to show His feelings and let His enemies know how they had succeeded in hurting Him, much less to ask any act of kindness from them. 'It is sometimes more difficult to ask a favour than to grant one; it requires more of the spirit of forgiveness.' But not only did our Lord ask a favour: He expected to receive it. We often do more through our weakness than we could ever do with our strength. Fancy a rough Roman soldier *running* to succour a helpless victim! This was victory indeed. How do you get through a strong wall? You find a spot of weakness in the wall—the door, and that is how you enter in. The making of the door means to that extent the weakening of the wall, but there is no other way of obtaining access. It was at the spot in the strong walls of the Godhead, that the Father deliberately weakened, that men have found access to His heart.

'Out of the strong came forth sweetness'—but only when life had been yielded up. Look through the letters that helped you at a crisis or in some hour of great sorrow in your life. You did not keep those glib assurances that all was for the best;

that time would heal; that all things work together for good to them that love God. It is never to those who are hard, or self-satisfied, or who have a comfortable and easy-going philosophy of life, or who think that there is nothing in human experience that needs explanation, that you instinctively turn in a time of need. That irritating phrase, 'It's all right,' is the watchword of the Devil. 'Hath He marks to lead me to Him?' is the question which suffering humanity will instinctively ask when darkness falls. I may not be able to see His face in the dark, but I can always feel His side. And when the world is tired of pretending that it has abolished pain and transcended weakness, and generally risen superior to circumstances, it will find its way back to where it can hear that honest, helpful confession, 'I thirst.' It will recognize the Saviour by that one cry.

In his *Recollections* a well-known man-of-letters and statesman, who was also an avowed agnostic, writes of one political crisis: 'Glad to find that I keep my head cooler than most.' The contrast between the merely superior man and the sublime man is brought out clearly in the picture which he gives of his political chief's conduct during another crisis. 'It was a Sunday afternoon. There the old fellow was, doing what old fellows have done for long ages on a Sunday afternoon, reading a big Bible.' Is there a touch of patronage, even of scorn here? The writer had the profoundest respect for his great leader. But he had yet to learn that it is to the old fellow reading the big Bible that hearts will turn, to the man who is great enough to know his weakness and the source of support, rather than to the other who complacently congratulates himself that he can keep his head cooler than most.

We are told that at the beginning of our Lord's public ministry He hungered, and that at the close He was athirst. That hunger and that thirst are His eternally until He shall have seen of the travail of His soul in a redeemed humanity. And is not this the motive of all our service, that we should have the privilege of holding the sponge to His lips; that running we may do somewhat to slake that great thirst for the souls of men?

Thou sayest this sad day 'I thirst' again,
And I, remembering how, to ease Thy pain,
Some harsh-faced Roman, stained and seared with war,
Gave Thee his vinegar
(And earned a fuller comfort than he gave),
Go forth to seek for Thee at Thy behest
Not only such suave souls as please me best,
But rough, sour souls that Thou did'st parch to save!

Religion and the Drama.¹

BY EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON, ABERDEEN.

I.

To-day for the first time since the emancipating yet disintegrating influences of the Renaissance, ordinary people are seeking, not, indeed, to recapture the old mediæval unity of system, but to discover a new unity of principle. It is demanded of this universal principle that it will contain a place within itself for every known phenomenon, and at the same time leave room for every possible discovery and development. The Christian mind of to-day has naturally joined in the search. For Christian thought, like all other thought, in the cases where it has freed itself from the old scholastic forms, has, ever since the Reformation, been autonomous, as politics have been, and art, and even philosophy.

But in the course of the search a most momentous thing has happened to the disciples and students of Jesus Christ :

And all *His* men

• Look at each other with a wild surmise . . .

They count not themselves to have apprehended, but they press on. For it is they, and no others, who seem to have sighted, or to whom has been revealed, the unifying and emancipating principle for which the whole world has been seeking ; and they have discovered it ; it has been revealed to them, in the Person and Purpose of Jesus Christ. It is of course true that saints and mystics have achieved

this principle of unity intuitionally, but it has never till to-day been applied as the supreme category of thought in the solution of the problem of the universe.

There still remains behind, however, a trail of the old type of thinking within the Christian Church, a point of view seamed and scarred both by the mediæval tradition, and by the individualistic reactions of the Renaissance. The man of this type still looks to religious authority for certain directions and instructions. He is willing, for instance, to be told what prayers to say, what feasts and fasts to observe, what theological beliefs to accept. All this he receives with the childlike simplicity with which a traveller would receive the translations of an interpreter in a foreign land. Religion has its experts, but—and here the disintegrating effects of the Renaissance are exposed—if religion is to have its experts, so must every other department of life. Is it a play ? We will see what the dramatic critic says about it. Is it a political relationship ? Leave that to the statesmen. Is it a philosophy of life ? The universities will deal with that. Is it a question of the division of wealth ? Let the economists settle that. Theoretically all this is excellent, but when it comes to the purpose of life we find that the critic has one purpose, the politician another, the philosopher another, and the economist another ; and the distracted Christian, while admitting each to be an expert, cannot but suspect that the play may be bad, the political relationship wrong, the philosophy false, and that the economist has mislaid a control. In short, he has not accustomed himself to apply the supreme category of thought to every department of life and experience. When the Church is composed of members who have learned to do that the hour of her great rebirth will have come.

Meanwhile it is our duty to study the implications of this principle in one detail after another, until our lesson is learned. What, we have here to ask, is the place of the drama as a manifestation of that universal and eternal principle which is the Mind of Christ ?

II.

The idea that the drama and everything to do with it is of the evil one probably first arose in

¹ *Modern Religious Dramas*, ed. by Fred Eastman. (Holt & Co., New York.)

Le Maître de la Mort, par M. de la Fuyé. (Librairie Plon. fr. 2.50.)

St. Paul. An historical play in three Acts. By Geoffrey Dearmer. (Heinemann. 2s. 6d.)

Hannele, by Gerhardt Hauptman. (The New Adelphi Library. 3s. 6d.)

Little Plays of St. Francis and The Comments of Juniper, by Laurence Houseman. (Sidgwick & Jackson.)

Saint Joan, by Bernard Shaw. (Constable.)

Johannis, by H. Sudermann.

The Kingdom of God, by G. M. Sierra. (Sidgwick & Jackson. 3s. 6d.)

The Servant in the House and The Terrible Meek, by C. R. Kennedy. (Harper.)

Outward Bound, by Sutton Vane. (Chatto & Windus.)

Good Friday, by John Masefield. (Heinemann.)

The Inheritors, by Susan Glaspel. (Ernest Benn.)

the Church out of pique when she prohibited the actors from using any longer the insides of the churches for their mystery plays, and the actors in revenge composed plays which mocked the Church. But the idea would not have persisted so long as it has done without other reason. The evil nature of many plays, the bad character of many persons associated with the stage, have fostered the notion in pious but illogical minds right down to the present time, but no serious thinker to-day wishes, even if such a thing were possible, to obliterate the theatre from society.

It is not that idea which we have to deal with seriously. What we have to show to be false to the Mind of Christ is that conception of the stage as something secular and apart from the religious life of the people, which goes along with the conception of the Church as something sacrosanct and apart from the secular life of the people.

Church and stage were not always so far apart as they are to-day. The first English religious play which has come down to us is known as the *Quem Queritis*, so called from the first words of the dialogue, and it dates from the tenth century. The play is to be acted in a church during Easter-tide. A white-robed priest sits by the altar, or in front of the crypt stairs; three other priests, also in white, and representing women, come, seeking, slowly down the nave.

First Priest. 'Whom do you seek in the sepulchre, O Christian women?'

Second, Third, and Fourth Priests. 'Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified, O heavenly one!'

First Priest.—'He is not here, He is risen even as He predicted. Go and announce that He is risen from the dead.'

The choir then sings out its *jubilate*, and the play is ended.

At a little later date came the Christmas plays, with their rather more complicated form—the birth of Jesus, the Shepherds scene, and the Three Kings scene. Sometimes these three scenes were shown in different parts of one church at the same time, sometimes the stage moved with the actors, *i.e.* the place they chose to halt in became for the time being the stage. These plays had a special educative value in an age when the hymns and prayers and words of Scripture were never heard except in the almost unknown Latin tongue. They became very dear to the common people; the rest of the service seemed more and more a dull affair, and quite incomprehensible. But you could make something of these plays, especially as the priests were beginning to throw in an English word here

and there, at a crucial point. The authorities began to grow suspicious of such a happy state of affairs, and to forbid the acting of the sacred stories within the sacred walls. Outside then the actors went, but they took their properties with them and played in the market square or the tavern yard in Cornwall they built little amphitheatres. An excellent account of all this movement is given in *The English Stage*, by Allardyce Nicoll (Benn's 6d. Library). The most extraordinary and significant fact about the drama in mediæval times, however, is that for centuries, even although it had been disowned by the Church, it managed to continue and even develop its religious character. But at last its resources were exhausted, because the knowledge, the scholarship, the inspiration, the vision which the Church might have given, she had denied. By the sixteenth century, then, we find a secularized theatre, hungrily absorbing the New Learning, developing, growing infinitely more complex and more fascinating, yet at the same time only an isolated and unrelated fragment in the brilliant, moving kaleidoscope of human society, and therefore having little real bearing upon progress or civilization. What significance it did have was due not to the theatre itself as an institution, but to the fact that here and there a great mind, and, above all, the mind of Shakespeare, had used it as its medium, and by so doing had given it a borrowed glory.

The old mediæval system was broken up, the hopeless but majestic conception of a society completely contained within the Church was for ever abandoned, and the medley fleet of human activities, arts, crafts, and professions, scattered upon the ocean of life, each self-sufficient, each pursuing its own goal, or, in words of deeper philosophic import, its own tail.

But we have not room here to consider the spectacle of the drama pursuing its own tail down the centuries, or to listen to its various justifications of its individualistic existence. No art, no science, and no philosophy liveth unto itself. As Archbishop Temple well put it the other day in a Broadcast talk, 'No sectional principle will do. Self-perfection, self-expression, "Art for art's sake," "Business is business," "My country right or wrong"—these are products of the modern departmentalism which has led us to moral bewilderment, æsthetic chaos, industrial class war, international and inter-racial jealousy with the suicide of civilisation as its inevitable outcome. The principle of unity which is to meet our need must be in its nature truly universal.'

III.

Can the Church, then, invite the actors back to her altars on the old terms? It would certainly be a hopeless invitation. For in those days the Church had high barred doors to her porches, and if she could not shut you in as a prisoner, she shut you out as an exile, and the poet and the actor both do better as exiles than as prisoners; but they do best of all when they are free sons of the house which knows no door save that one which says, 'I am the Door. If any one enters in by me he will find safety, and will go in and out and find pasture.' Through that Door, then, they are bound to return, when the wild surmise of the few has become the working faith of the many, the faith that Christ is indeed 'the visible representative of the invisible God . . . through whom the universe is a harmonious whole.'

In this wider conception of the place of the drama in religious life, that is, in a complete society, we have indeed far more to learn from the Greeks than from the mediæval Church. 'Picture an audience of 20,000 sitting for six days in an open-air theatre witnessing with intense interest the presentation of from twenty to thirty dramas—and you picture the greatest project in adult religious education which the world has yet seen. The Greeks produced that project, and it was so successful that they maintained it for nearly five hundred years. It was not a private or commercial project, but one developed by the State as a means of cultivating the spiritual and æsthetic life of citizens. The State counted this project so important that during the dramatic productions all business was abandoned, law courts closed, and prisoners released from jail. Attendance was not compulsory, but the interest of the people was so keen that more than half the entire population of Athens turned out to see the plays.

'From first to last these dramas were not regarded as entertainment, but as a distinctly educational and religious venture. As education they took the place of newspapers, books, and magazines, and the tragic poets were looked upon as the teachers of the people. As religion they served as an act of homage to the god Dionysus. They were given in the sacred places and at the sacred season of the year. The poets who wrote the plays and the actors who played them were regarded as ministers of religion, and their persons were held inviolable. The theatre itself possessed the sanctity of a temple, and the chief seats in it were reserved for the priests.

'The success of this project in adult education

may be measured from the fact that it not only brought forth some of the world's greatest poets, but it developed the æsthetic and imaginative life of the people of Athens to such an extent that to this day their name is the symbol of culture. In the course of a few centuries Athens, with a population of 30,000, gave to the world more great poets and artists than America has yet produced out of a population of 115,000,000.' These words are taken from the admirable preface of Professor Eastman's book.

Something on similar lines is what we must have in the near future, and there is a widespread movement, both here and in America, towards development along these lines. The writer from whose book we have just quoted is Professor of Religious Literature and Drama in Chicago Theological Seminary. He teaches his students how to write and to produce plays, he studies the great modern, mediæval, and ancient plays with them, and in the volume before us he gives us eleven one act plays, all of which he believes will pass the following tests:

'Is the play interesting?

Will it have a religious effect upon the audience?

Do the characters have the breath of life in them?

Does the play have an adequate plot involving strong situation, conflict, suspense, choice, climax, and satisfactory solution?

Does it succeed in reaching the emotions?

Is the dialogue natural?

Does the play come within the limitations of the average church's equipment and cast?

Will it have a religious value for the actors?

Will its total effect point out or mirror the truths of life?

Again, in his preface, Professor Eastman says: 'To-day, as in ancient Greece and mediæval England, we whose chief interest in life is religion—and especially a religion of power which challenges men's consciences, and brings aid to them in their spiritual struggles—are turning quite naturally to drama. For the essence of drama is struggle. The deepest struggles of our life are religious. The drama, more than any other art, deals with the emotional and spiritual struggles of life, and the clash of human wills. It is not a matter of chance or fad, but a course of action deep rooted in historical precedent, that in a day of revived emphasis in our religion upon the challenge to the will to right wrongs, to take up the cross of Jesus and live life dangerously, we enlist the art of drama to catch the conscience of our people.'

Nor is this writer alone in his opinions about the

near future of the religious drama. 'When the new prophet comes,' says Dean Inge, 'I am disposed to think that he will choose to speak to his generation neither from the pulpit nor from the platform nor from the printed page, but from the stage. A great dramatist might help us to find our souls.'

IV.

When we come to the plays themselves, we must admit we are disappointed. It is difficult to explain why so little of our really great dramatic or poetic literature is specifically Christian, and why almost inevitably, just as soon as the definite Christian or even religious atmosphere is felt, the quality as literature seems to wane. Professor Gilbert Murray's explanation is interesting, if not altogether satisfying. His theory is that poetry has its roots so deep down in human nature, 'in time far beyond our earliest record, in psychology deep below our ordinary consciousness,' that its origins lie in regions of quietness and calm, far 'ben' behind those analytic, critical, deliberative functionings which are still at play with regard to the coming of Jesus Christ. Still, Professor Murray thinks, that greatest event in history is too near us in time to have reached those primæval inarticulate parts of experience; it is still, with us, the practical rather than the poetical imagination that is touched, Francis of Assisi rather than William Shakespeare. It is certainly a deeply interesting theory, if rather a discouraging one for the Christian artist.

Is there possibly an altogether different reason for the absence of great modern Christian plays? A great play has to be written with passion, with abandon, but ours is a self-conscious age. As one fine thinker has said: 'When we want to write religion for the stage it is self-consciously pushed into another century, or hung like a garment upon some more recognizedly saintly figure—St. Francis, for instance—some one who is revered and hallowed by common counsel, and who is also remote. We need to feel put at our ease, so to speak, by putting these tremendous words into a mouth we should not suddenly risk hearing speak quite close to us or in our own homes. We have no objection to an atmosphere, but we are not keen about personal implications. We should not care to look at modern religious conflict of conversion on the stage, except as secondary interest.'

Of the plays in Professor Eastman's book the finest is surely *The Valiant*, by Holworthy Hall and Robert Middlemass. The play seems to us

to answer the questions which we have quoted from the preface to the collection, in a much fuller sense than do any of the rest.

All the other plays on our list are good, some of them are quite beautiful, *St. Joan* is unique in achieving greatness. But if you confronted Professor Gilbert Murray with *St. Joan* as damaging to his theory about the absence of great Christian drama to-day, he would reply that in this case Christianity has only taken over and made its own the oldest and best beloved of the heroic motives, that of the martyr. Sudermann's *John the Baptist*, little known in this country, and I do not think translated, is a noble piece of work. Masfield's religious plays are far below his best writing, but perhaps have to be seen on the stage to be fully appreciated. Laurence Houseman's *Little Plays of St. Francis*, his *Comments of Juniper*, and *Four Further Plays*, are all lovely things. Among successful acting religious plays, *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*, *Outward Bound*, *The Servant in the House*, and *The Terrible Meek*, all take a good place; Sierra's *Kingdom of God* and Susan Glaspel's *The Inheritors* make good reading as well. Geoffrey Dearmer's *St. Paul* is an attempt to depict the growing development of the apostle, but it is not very suitable for the stage. Hauptman's *Hannele* had a good run, but hardly on account of its religious content. The Book of *Amos* has been dramatized by Hetty Lee, the story of *Joseph and his Brethren* by the late Temple Gairdner of Cairo, and there are numerous other more or less propaganda plays, especially on the subjects of peace and of missions, which can be had from various societies. But propaganda is terribly dangerous, nay, it is impossible material for good drama, for it deals with details, and the very essence of drama is that it shall rise out of the immediate present, out of particulars into universals, that it shall hover in the atmosphere of transcendental being, freed from the minutiae of daily living, yet only free in order that it may seize upon that which gives reality to life—conflict, love, death, immortality. To gather up these transcendental moments out of lives grand, simple, obscure, and to weld all that the Greeks meant by *extasis*, into all that the Christian means when he says, 'It is no longer I that live, but Christ that lives in me,' to show life at its most immense, its most desperate heights and depths, and to show in those conflicts the same conflict that turned the face of Jesus toward Jerusalem to die, that surely is the adventure towards which the drama of to-morrow, and the Christian Church, will move hand in hand.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Parrot Disease.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. DICKSON, M.A., M.TH.,
PETERHEAD.

'Whatsoever things are true, . . . honest, . . . pure, . . . think on these things. Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, . . . do.'—Ph 4⁸⁻⁹.

I WONDER if you are interested just now in a new disease we are reading about in the newspapers chiefly because it has such a queer name. Really it has two names: one, the name doctors give it, and that I'm sure you wouldn't care to spell; the other, the name that everybody else uses. It is called Parrot Disease.

The doctors are worried about Parrot Disease. They say it is rather dangerous, and they are not yet quite sure of its cause or cure. You see, in our country at least, it is a new kind of ailment, and we must give the doctors time to find out a lot more about it before we can expect them to cure it.

But really, I doubt if Parrot Disease is such a very new disease. Lots of people appear to suffer from it. There is a friend of mine who has a parrot, and that bird seems such a cheery fellow, singing and whistling all day long. If you were to visit my friend, Polly would welcome you with screeches of delight. He would cock his eye at you in the friendliest possible way and say invitingly, 'Hallo, old chap, shake a paw, shake a paw!' But, my word! if you did try to shake his paw he would give you the ugliest, wickedest bite. Then he would laugh and laugh in your very face as he watched you suck your injured finger.

Some children have contracted that kind of Parrot Disease. They pretend to be ever so friendly and then, when they think you are sure of their friendliness, they take advantage of it, and they hurt. They pretend to be very chummy, but they are selfish and unkind. That kind of pretending is a very dangerous form of Parrot Disease.

But I know another parrot whose symptoms are different. (You know what symptoms are? If you get all sick and hot and covered with red spots, the doctor comes along and says, 'Ah! these are the symptoms of measles.') This bird is counted a wonderfully good fellow; in fact, some of his admirers who don't know him very well think he

is 'rather a religious parrot. You have heard, I suppose, that some silly people teach their parrots to say extremely naughty words. Well, the lady who owns this particular bird was determined that her parrot would never learn to say anything shocking, so what do you think she did? She taught him to repeat texts from the Bible. Sammy—that is his name—will sit on his perch and look very solemn and very thoughtful, and for hours he will say nothing. That is how some parrots and people make others believe they are fearfully good and wise—they just sit on their perches and look very solemn and say nothing. Then on a day when Sammy's mistress has some ladies in to tea, and they have all been talking at once, and suddenly there is a pause while they are thinking of what to say next, just when everybody is silent Sammy will say in a low, solemn voice, 'God is love, God is love.' Of course, all the ladies look at Sammy and exclaim, 'What a charming bird! I'm sure he understands what he says, he looks so wise. Dear me! aren't parrots wonderful creatures!' And Sammy nearly bursts with pride.

But listen to Sammy after the party is over. If his mistress forgets to give him sugar he brings the whole house down with his cries. Even when he has had his sugar, and everybody is quietly in bed, Sammy will utter the most piercing shrieks all night long—just for spite.

You see, the bother with Sammy is that, with all his wise looks, he speaks without thinking. Now, it is no good being able to repeat, 'God is love,' unless you think and act on what you are saying. Lots of you are learning texts in Sunday school and at home, but do you always think what they mean and try to act on their meaning? If you don't, you've got Parrot Disease. And I must tell you that this form of the disease is worst when it attacks Sunday-school girls and boys, who repeat the beautiful truths they have been taught without thinking and acting on their meaning.

Now, let me offer you a cure, or, better still, a prescription which, if you follow it, will prevent you ever catching the infection. First, always be sincere. Don't pretend. Don't be a little sneak. Second, think on all the good things you are taught. When I say that, I mean think on them so that they will become part of you, and you will act on them.

Don't be like a silly parrot that thoughtlessly repeats good words and then makes life just wretched for everybody around. You are not really good because you can repeat your text every Sunday. You will only be a worth-while boy when you try to understand its meaning, and to put its meaning into action.

You've heard of that splendid hero, Paul, and you know he wrote a number of fine letters to his friends, and always he urged them to put into practice the great things he had taught them, and that he himself had learnt of Jesus. Paul had some friends at Philippi, and though most of them were really fine folk, some of them, I am sorry to say, contracted Parrot Disease. And this is the cure Paul gave them—'Whatever things are true, honest, pure, *think* on these things; and those things which ye have learned, and received, and heard, *do*.' THINK, and DO.

The Signed Picture.

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD BICKLEY, B.D.,
NORTHAMPTON.

'He made it again.'—Jer 18⁴.

One autumn morning a young Scotch boy took his easel, his paints, and two or three clean pieces of paper carefully pinned on his drawing-board, down to the bank of a little stream near his village. He sat down by the stream to paint. All the morning he worked hard at his picture, and at lunch-time he lay down on the grass to rest and eat his lunch, which his mother had packed in a nice little box for him. Just then two men strolled along the river-bank, and when they came to the boy, one of them stopped and bent down to look at his painting. 'Is this your painting?' the elder man said. 'Yes, sir,' said the boy. 'Would you like me to help you with it?' 'Yes, please.' 'You have made a few mistakes; the perspective is wrong. Let me show you how to do it correctly.' So the stranger sat down on the bank, took the board and the painting on his knees, dipped a brush in the water, and began to wash out all the picture. 'Don't do that, sir,' said the boy, almost in tears. 'It has taken me all morning to do that much.' 'That's all right, my laddie; but you're not doing it correctly. Let me show you. We will begin all over again.' So when the man had washed out the boy's painting, he began to sketch the scene in beautiful colours. The boy sat beside him with wondering eyes. At last the picture was completed, the stranger gave the boy sixpence, and went on his way with his friend to the village.

The boy didn't stay longer; he packed up his things and hurried home, to show his mother the beautiful landscape picture and tell her all that had happened. Of course the boy was curious to know who the stranger was, and it didn't take him long to discover that the man who had painted his picture was none other than Sir John Millais, the great English artist who did so much to revive British art in the last century. Every autumn, Sir John Millais was accustomed to stay in one or other of these Scotch villages. Most of his beautiful landscapes were painted there.

Now, that boy never forgot that such a great man had helped him, and he determined to become an artist. So he stuck to his work, and in a few years' time he won a scholarship and came to London to study, and there at the head of the school of art where he chose to study was this same famous artist who had helped him years before. He spoke to Sir John Millais, and reminded him of that autumn morning when he washed out a boy's painting and gave him his first real lesson in art; and the great man said, 'Bring the sketch along and I will sign it,' and he signed it with his own name as his own original work.

My friend who told me the story said, 'I was that boy, and my most prized and valued possession is that signed landscape by Sir John Millais.'

I like to think how that great master of art washed out all that was wrong in the boy's painting and made it again for him. I know quite a number of true stories like that in the New Testament. Jesus came across men and women who were doing wrong things with their lives. They were making wrong pictures of themselves, they were putting selfishness, greed, pride, unkindness, and many sinful things into their lives. When Jesus saw them He said, 'You are doing wrong with your life; let Me wash out all the wrong things and make your life again, and show you how to live.' He made Zaccheus again, a beautiful, kind, unselfish life. He made Paul again, and everybody who really knew him loved him. When Jesus re-made them they were far more beautiful than they were before, and He signed them with His own new name, so that when people saw one of them they said, 'He is a Christian; he has been made again by Jesus.'

Jesus comes to you girls and boys who are not making the best of your lives. He says, 'Let Me show you how to live, how to be kind and good and loving; let Me help you to live like Me.' If we say Yes, and mean it, then we shall be pictures of Jesus signed with His name, and our lives will be the most beautiful things any one can see.

The Christian Year.

EASTER SUNDAY.

Immortality.

'Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?'—1 Co 15¹².

The number of those who boldly assert their denial of any future life is few, but occasionally one finds men more bold than their fellows who are prepared to assert definitely that all hope of a future life is illusory. In Mr. Wyndham Lewis's book, *The Art of being Ruled*, this attitude is adopted. 'Christ's doctrine,' he says, 'was a drug. Beneath its influence men saw their wrongs being righted, saw "the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," punished and humble faith rewarded, the last first and the first last. Is it,' he continues, speaking of the teaching of Jesus, 'the action of an honourable man to give people these flattering visions?' For one man thus outspoken, there are twenty whose minds are filled with questionings. There were men in the early Church who felt like this. Perhaps they did not boldly assert that dead men do not rise, but they doubted the Apostle's teaching, and in 1 Co 15 Paul strives to demonstrate the certainty of the faith in the individual's resurrection to eternal life.

1. Paul had one advantage over the modern preacher. Few of those whom he addressed doubted the truth of the Resurrection of Jesus, for it was impossible for them to do so. They need only go to former unbelievers like James the brother of the Lord to find him tell the story of the appearance of the Lord which turned his hostility into loyalty; or to cautious disciples like Thomas, who except he had seen would not have believed; or they could find at hand many of the five hundred brethren of whom Paul writes, 'the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.' The early Church was living on the impulse communicated to it by the appearance of the Risen Lord. The preachers proclaimed no conquered leader, lying in a Syrian tomb, but a living Lord who had kept His appointed tryst with His favoured followers and who had made His power manifest in their midst. The Jewish world is keenly interested in a book published by the foremost orthodox Jewish scholar of our time. Although other writers, such as the historian, S. Setzer, and Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky, caused much comment by their books urging the Jewish people to reconsider their attitude to Jesus, Dr. Klausner's book,

Jesus of Nazareth, in which the author represents Jesus as the embodiment of ethical and religious idealism, has caused a sensation. There is much which causes sorrow to a Christian in this brilliant book, but the treatment of the Resurrection is significant. While he believes that Joseph of Arimathea, after having laid the body of Jesus in his new tomb, secretly removed it at the close of the Sabbath, and placed it in an unknown grave, he denies that there was any deception on the part of the early Church. 'The nineteen hundred years' faith of millions is not founded on deception. There can be no question but that some of the ardent Galileans saw their Lord and Messiah in a vision.' As Christians we are convinced that there was reality behind the visions. 'If Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?' We do not doubt that Jesus overcame death, why do we doubt that others than He may share the victory over the last enemy of all?

When from the dead He rais'd His Son

And called Him to the sky,

He gave our souls a lively hope

That they should never die.

2. In addition to this argument which we may call the argument from history, Paul used another argument which may be regarded as the argument of the emotions. As the years pass, heaven becomes a more powerful conception in the thought of all good people. The vacant chairs on earth remind us of appointed places in the Father's home.

I never stand beside a bier and see

The seal of death set on some well-loved face,

But that I say one more to welcome me

When I have crossed the intervening space

Between this land and that land over there,

One more to make the strange Beyond seem fair.

We are so conscious of failure in our own lives that we would not charge God with harshness if He did not consider our lives worth conserving, but allowed them to be extinguished as a match by the night winds; but we have known lives of such saintliness that we are sure that God has other work for them to do. The Church at Corinth had its roll of saints, with regard to whom the thought of extinction was impossible. Unbelieving husbands, heedless sons, could remember wives, mothers, sisters, brothers who had witnessed a good confession, and many turned to Christianity because they believed it held out to them a hope of being reunited with the beloved one who had gone. Confining our-

selves to one of the many possible meanings of Paul's words, we find this idea behind the question, 'What shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?' Many careless Corinthians who had refused to listen to the pleadings of devoted Christian relatives when they had been with them, found themselves longing for the handclasp of a departed friend and for 'the sound of a voice that was still,' and the promise of reunion which the Christian faith offered had proved the determining influence in winning them for allegiance to Christ and for witnessing to that faith in baptism.

3. The third argument is that based on the lives of the men who formed the early Church. If they had desired, they might have been as others, interested only in worldly aims. 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Instead, it was apparent that they were living their lives on a higher level, striving to realize noble ideals which time did not create and which time could not destroy.

So much of the weakness of our religious life to-day arises from the fact that we do not truly believe and put to the test these great words, and many others like them. Divested of the garments of our frail mortality, the soul goes on to a life more wonderful by far. To the Christian, death is an episode in life, an adventure at one stage of the long journey which brings us to God. The great gift of God is not immortality, but something better, a possession infinitely greater, eternal life, which is already possible in this world through such a union with God in Christ that the death of the body cannot interfere with it in any way whatever.

Jesus uttered words which make us know that the departed are living a life more glorious than any we know, following the great Captain of our salvation in another state of being more glorious than any we can imagine. 'Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.' Our sorrow must therefore be accompanied by its note of triumph. It is not for us to allow our imagination to carry us beyond the simple yet unfathomable words of the Master.¹

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

In this Life most Miserable.

'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.'—I Co 15¹⁹.

1. Do these words mean that if the Christian hope of life everlasting is never to be realized, then

¹ A. Chisholm, *High Roads and Cross Roads*, 80.

the Christian life is one of uncompensated delusion, an irrecoverable waste of a singular opportunity? With such an interpretation of St. Paul's words many thoughtful people cannot agree. On the contrary they hold, whatever may be the future after death, that the Christian life is the finest in quality, the widest in scope, the most animating in spirit the world has hitherto been able to conceive; and that should there be no life when this life is over, the man who has lived the Christian life and cherished the Christian hope, which is inseparable from the Christian life, has made the best of the only existence he is ever to know.

2. Whatever St. Paul meant we must not be intimidated by texts. We must understand them. If we would understand this text we must put ourselves in the time and place of him who wrote it. Indeed, we must do so in all our Bible reading if we would escape the misapplications and misinterpretations of Scripture which have made some men unbelievers and others fanatics.

Now, if we try to put ourselves back into St. Paul's day and position, imperfectly as we may be able to do so, we see that the life of the Christian propagandist was one of exhausting labour, anxiety, and suffering. But the cause of the suffering was not directly Christianity itself; it was the hostile action of Jewish and pagan society upon Christianity. To communicate what Paul considered the Divine revelation of a Father in heaven and life with Him for ever, he had to become an outcast from his family and descend from his high social position, to renounce his place in the government of his people and his prospects of distinction; he had to run counter to his intellectual tastes, to adapt himself to the society of classes beneath him, whose manners and speech and idea of life were all against the grain. He had to endure suspicion and stiffness and secret hostility from the party he had joined and to whom he brought so much, as well as incessant attacks upon his orthodoxy and the validity of his orders. In addition, he was subjected, with painful frequency, to violent bodily persecution.

Now, if suddenly, when Paul was near the end of life, worn out with labour and suffering, and murmuring to himself, as his tired eyes looked up to heaven, 'Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness,' if *then* a fatal, infallible voice had struck upon his soul: 'There is no living Christ, no life to come, no God, no heaven in the wide grey, lampless world,' proclaiming that all his labours and sufferings had been endured for a great delusion, then we can understand the thought—

sharp as a knife stabbing into the heart, blinding the soul in a black hopeless night—bursting out into a passionate cry of irresistible unmeditated protest, ‘If in this life only we have hope in Christ, then are we of all men most miserable.’ But amid all his miseries Paul was not miserable. On the contrary he described himself as ‘sorrowful yet always rejoicing, as having nothing and yet possessing all things.’ Those who realize the Christian life, and believe in the ever-continued development of the soul in a life continued after death, attain the highest possibilities of which this human nature is capable.

3. Nevertheless, there is widespread a sort of belief or feeling that a Christian life, when thoroughly carried out, is a joyless one of self-suppression, and not one of complete self-development, and is only to be undertaken for the sake of unspeakable bliss hereafter. In harmony with such a misconception are the words once spoken by Dr. Newman: ‘This world is a very little thing to give up for the next. Yet if we give it up in heart and conversation we shall gain the next.’ On the contrary, it is a crime to give up this world. For this world is as truly the world of God as is the unseen world.

Whatever may be the nature of the next life, it cannot be the same as this. For this life is a combination made up of body and spirit. But we know that death disintegrates the body, for ‘flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.’ To lose what this world and its Divine combination may do for us, is to condemn ourselves to be so much the poorer for evermore. This has been well said by Browning when he declared that the true end of this life is the expansion of the human soul into a love passing out of itself with some other soul to mingle:

Else it loses what it lived for,
And eternally must lose it;
Better ends may be in prospect,
Deeper blisses (if you choose it),
But this life’s end and this love-bliss
Have been lost here.

4. What is the central idea of Christianity? It aims, as its central idea, at the reconciliation of man with God. Now, as the whole order of the universe is a product of the creative mind of God, reconciliation with God must mean harmony with the indwelling, energizing mind of the universe, of which man (body and mind) is the highest manifestation known to us. Reconciliation with God means

man’s body and mind realizing their potential perfection; the mind of God inherent in them. It will be admitted, even by moralists who do not appeal to a Divine sanction, that, on the whole and in the long run, happiness arises from virtue. Would a man who had lived a life of temperance say on his deathbed, if then he became convinced that there was no life for him when he was dead: ‘If I had my time to live over again I would not be restrained from the gratifications of drink, but would take the jovialities and intoxication of a drunkard’? When we see the shattered, degraded, burnt-up beings who have succumbed to this degrading vice, who of us would think he had wasted a chance because he had not experienced this? Are sullenness and malignancy, the meanness of the liar, the feline caution of dealers in dishonesty, the apprehensions of the underhanded, the greed which pinches a home, the crossness which darkens it, the cruelty which terrorizes it, and the unfaithfulness which shatters it—are these the dispositions and experiences a man would choose to possess, if he were sure there was no life after this? Whether it be true that things are right because they produce happiness, or that happiness is the preordained result of right conduct, whatever be our moral theory—Eudæmonism or a Divine moral order—happiness and virtue are by the nature of things allied.

But the aim of Christianity is to make all men virtuous, to reconcile them to God’s moral order; and therefore if virtue tends to happiness, and Christianity tends to virtue, then does Christianity tend to happiness. It condemns extravagance, intemperance, ungoverned and consuming passions, the secret and sly paths of dishonesty, the dishonour and infamy of a life of vice. It bids us honour the body and cultivate the mind, and elevate the spiritual nature and be temperate in all things. It tends to lengthen the days, to prolong happiness, to keep off disease, to assuage mental distress, to give peace and courage to the conscience, to make a man a fine and noble creature in mind, body, and estate. All the virtues which good men cultivate and hold in honour, even when they do not believe in God, are enforced by Christianity. Beauty and truth and love; all that science can tell, and art can show, and honourable ambition attain, and manly and womanly pleasure enjoy, ‘all things are yours and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.’

5. But through it all, says the Agnostic, is the delusion of another life after this. But how do you know it is a delusion? If ours is a delusion it is

not an ignoble delusion. It is the delusion which expects a to-morrow. But is it ignoble for the scientist to hope to complete to-morrow his investigation, or for the artist to hope to-morrow to realize his ideal of beauty? All our to-morrows have an element of uncertainty about them, for death stops the investigation, and the picture, the poem, and the music are unfinished; and there are no wedding bells. Yet do we look for to-morrow, and to-morrow is heaven—for heaven is our idea of perfection, and to live a life with the ideal and hope of perfection is the highest life which can be lived. If it can never be attained, it is a supreme distinction to have had it. Now at least we may confidently say that under all possibilities the Christian life is the finest that can be attained; and interpreting the exclamation of St. Paul for ourselves, we may reverse it and say, 'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, still are we of all men most blessed.'¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Faith, an Activity of the Soul.

'The work of faith.'—1 Th 1^a.

1. Of the three phrases which the Apostle uses in this verse—'The work of faith, the labour of love, the patience of hope'—the one which is most difficult to understand with exactness is certainly the first, 'the work of faith.'

'The labour of love'—that comes home to us all at once. We know that love at its purest has within itself the quality of pain. Love is, indeed, an election to suffering. A pure love lays us open to a thousand assaults of suspense and fear.

The other phrase—'the patience of hope'—if somewhat more obscure, also comes home to us at once as something which we ourselves know to be true. We only need to consider for a moment to see that patience is the very heart of hope. To be living by a great hope is for any one of us to be living in the midst of fears. To be living in this world on some private hope is like carrying some precious vessel across a crowded street. Anything may happen. A strong hope introduces us at once to a new world of misgivings and possible disasters. Like love, like any spiritual call, like any word of God, hope brings not peace, but a sword.

In the same way—so the Apostle must mean—work is the very soul of faith, the very atmosphere in which faith lives. We know that where love is, there is that inner condition of longing and

suspense and prayer—a true travail of the soul. We know, too, that where hope is, there will always be need of patience, the soul steadying itself under the shock of many a disappointment. In the same way—so the Apostle assumes—faith put its own kind of strain upon the soul; faith too involves us in a kind of life of its own. He who would have his lamp of faith burn brightly must see to it that he lives in an atmosphere of work. He must see to it that he purge his soul of all indolence and heaviness; that he gird up the loins of his mind; that he respond to all his surroundings, acting and reacting, maintaining a certain alertness and watchfulness, accepting and rejecting, according to a kind of spiritual taste or standard within himself. In short, faith also puts the soul upon a certain strain; and as the strain of love has for its note, labour, and as the strain of hope has for its note, patience, so the strain of faith has for its note, *work*.

2. Now, at the very outset, this is not the opinion about faith which we find amongst outsiders. In their view, faith is a form of human weakness or insincerity. Now the point of this text is that here St. Paul says something about *faith* which is the very opposite of all that. He says it is not the easy and convenient thing—to believe; but the hard and inconvenient thing.

Yes: the easy thing certainly is, not to believe. Faith is surely harder than sight, and bears witness to a finer and more delicate perception. It is easier to build a fence than to write a poem. It is easier to be engaged in the business of the world—its eating and drinking and its pleasures—than to feel the power and summons of that other world of which the best souls are aware. It is easier to see nothing than to see God. Fifty men, a thousand men, can walk over the fields in the evening, for one who, as he walks, can feel what Wordsworth felt when he wrote the lines on Tintern Abbey. And which of them was right? The fifty men who saw nothing, or Wordsworth who saw God; the fifty men who felt nothing, or Wordsworth who 'felt the Presence which disturbs us with the joy of elevated thoughts, the sense sublime of something far more deeply interfused, whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, and the round ocean, and the living air, and the blue sky, and in the mind of man'?

It is surely easier to see than to believe. Well, that is the idea underlying the words 'the work of faith.' And the idea is that faith lives within an atmosphere of work, of spiritual liveliness, and daring.

¹ W. Page-Roberts, *True Religion*, 35.

3. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews defines faith as 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' That is to say, he who has faith has within himself as his own personal secret the proof and the pledge of things not seen. It is by his faith that he perceives the unseen world and takes hold on God. It is therefore the work of faith to keep clear and free from all obstacles and hindrances and distorting mediums the passage between one's soul and God.

Now one thing which that involves is that a man must deal strictly with himself. He must take charge of his own personal integrity and honour. For let us never forget that one can believe only what he is meanwhile living for. Anything else is not faith. It is at best superstition; it is an attempt to outwit God by a manœuvre. We believe in the unseen only as we live for the unseen. We believe in the soul and in God only as we reverence the soul—the Divine capacity in ourselves and in others. Let any one live frankly for this world, and what is the penalty? Many things doubtless, but this for certain: that person loses all happy sense of God.

It is laid upon each one of us, and it ought to be a happy responsibility—it is our work of faith—to take up the obscure tasks within ourselves which we know must be attended to if we are to live on happy terms with Jesus Christ our Lord. We must see to it that the Holy Spirit has His way with us. We must work along with the Holy Spirit, we must work *out*, work out in real actions within ourselves and in the world also, what the Holy Ghost is working into us. If we refuse this work of faith, if we disregard and put aside these private instructions of the Holy Spirit—why, then, we are like children who have disobeyed a mother whom all the time they love—we are unhappy even in our disobedience, and we shall never be happy again until, like children too, we fling ourselves in sorrow and confession upon that loving One whom indeed we love, although for one miserable hour we disobeyed Him.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Things which destroy Joy.

'Your joy no man taketh from you.'—Jn 16²².

It has sometimes been said that we do not emphasize the dreadfulness of sin to-day, that we slur it over.

But was Jesus continually inveighing against sin and denouncing those glaring sins which went

on in His time as much as in ours? Was He continually dwelling on those grosser sins which prurient people love to hear denounced from the pulpit? No; the things He chiefly denounced were just the very things which religious people don't like hearing denounced because they are the things to which they probably are most prone. The things He really did use hard words about were the sins of the religious people of His time—hardness of heart, uncharitableness, inhumanity, self-righteousness, pride, and hypocrisy. His method was rather to show the beauty of goodness and the marvellous love of God for men in such a manner that people would see for themselves the dreadfulness of their lives, the hopelessness of living away or apart from God. Except in the case of the Pharisees His message to the people was almost entirely positive rather than negative. He put before them good, and the joy of goodness; He talked to them of happiness and how happiness could be obtained by positive virtues; He showed them love and all that it means; and those who heard with their hearts saw the pettiness and misery of their futile lives and became new people. Sin is a dreadful thing, for it is that by which we put a cloud between ourselves and God; the light of God's love cannot get through; and so surely the best way to get rid of that cloud is to tell of the love that is ready to break through, rather than to harp continually on the cloud that hides it.

1. The things which destroy joy in our hearts are those which put this cloud between us and Him; we no longer feel the sun's warmth and healing power and the joy goes out of life.

The root of all sin is selfishness. Selfishness is the antithesis of that self-giving which is Love. We do not emphasize enough our Lord's teaching about the heart. 'Out of the heart of men proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies,' these are the things which defile a man; we see a man's actions and we judge his actions, but it is that which is in his heart, *i.e.* his thoughts, which matters most; if a man's heart is full of self there is no room for God, as Trench says:

God often would enrich, but finds not where to place
His treasure, nor in hand nor heart a vacant space.

Now each of us can know our own thoughts, and what is more we can to a very large extent control them. It is not necessarily sin to have evil, selfish, licentious, or impure thoughts, because they may

¹ J. A. Hutton, *The Fear of Things*, 35.

come spontaneously; but it is to dwell on them, because we can try to think of other things. St. Paul is teaching this truth when he says: 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things.' The greatest saints I know are those whose minds are filled with beautiful thoughts, and especially thoughts of how they can help others and kindly thoughts about others. One feels instinctively that God is close to them because the love in their hearts has thrown out selfishness; in fact, they seem to have no time to think of themselves. And the things which destroy joy are just those things which make us think about ourselves. The answer of Moody to the man who asked him if he were saved, 'I am so busy trying to help others that I have no time to think of myself,' might well be taken to heart by a great many people who worry about themselves.

2. The things which destroy joy in our lives are just the very things which we religious people have to guard against—self-righteousness, pride, hypocrisy, self-satisfaction, envy, hatred, and malice; and it is time that we Church people should realize not only how soul-destroying these things are to the spiritual life, but also how much harm they are doing to the cause of Christ and His Church. If the joy of the first Christians was one of the chief reasons why people were attracted to Christ, and joined His goodly fellowship, and the lack of it in Christians to-day is keeping people out, we have to study the reasons why we have got away from the early Christian attitude; and few will deny that the chief reason is to be found in just those things which our Lord denounced in the Pharisees—self-satisfaction, pride, pompousness, snobbery, small-mindedness, censoriousness, and lack of sympathy and real love in dealing with others; and these are unfortunately only too noticeable both in the clergy and the laity.

We know well enough that snobbery is to be found in every class of society to-day. But the one place where it should not be found is in the Church and among Christian people, for the man who is a snob loses all sense of that joy which is able to abound and be abased as well. A certain padre in the war, a very able man, went to the officer commanding his unit one day, and asked him why it was he did not seem to be getting on with the men in that unit, to which the officer replied: 'You have asked me a plain question, and I will

give you a plain answer. It is because you are such a snob.' All the padre could answer was, 'I believe I am.'

Closely allied to snobbishness is our ungentlemanliness. There can be no better definition of the word gentleman than a man like Jesus Christ, for there was nothing in His character of weakness or sentimentality, but there was everything of strength and courage and courteousness in His dealings with others. Unfortunately the term has come to be used of, and applied to one section of society, so that the accident of birth is the only passport into this category; and, in consequence, men and women ape this section in dress and speech. It has come to matter a great deal more whether a man does not wear brown boots with a tail coat than whether he is courteous and kindly to others, and especially those dependent on him. The unchristian—which means the ungentlemanly—behaviour of people in all grades of society, is responsible more than anything else for our social troubles. Through our ungentlemanliness we lose a great deal of the joy of life, the joy of seeing others happy and contented, and the joy of knowing that we are playing the game by them even if they do not respond.

3. It is time that some of us who profess and call ourselves Christians did some healthy changing of our minds about some of these things. We have allowed ourselves to adopt the standard of the society in which we live, and have got away from Christ's standard. There is no Christian joy in the heart of the man who is always worrying about whether he has got the position he deserves, or thinking of his rights. Our Lord's saying: 'It shall not be so with you,' needs emphasis to-day. It is frightening when we read of societies being formed to secure the rights of the clergy, or to hear that young men won't become parsons because of insecurity of tenure or the encroachment of the laity on their rights: it all sounds so sub-Christian.

Are we altogether right in our ideas about the magnification of the office of a clergyman? The ordinary Church layman wants his vicar to be a 'big' man in town or village, to take a certain place in its society, and to remember the dignity of his office. Above all, he must be dignified, which generally means that he must be just a little remote; and one sees men gradually losing just that human touch and approachableness, and becoming afraid of giving away themselves or their position. There is a standard type to which we must conform, and once we conform to type we lose our naturalness, and with it the joy of being ourselves. We

think of the office and not the work, and aim at a false dignity. We have a tremendously responsible and honourable position as priests and ambassadors for God, but the position will not help us to be of use to God and to do His work unless we hold it as servants of Christ and of our fellow-men, as ministers and instruments for God to use. He can use our personality, our humanity, because we have placed ourselves in His hands. Once we 'put on side,' or fail to be human, we lose our influence for good, because nothing could be more unlike Christ than that; the spontaneous joy of being led by the spirit of Christ has gone.¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Capitalized Grace.

'The unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also.'—2 Ti 1⁶.

Is this reference to Timothy's grandmother and mother to be taken as anything more than a pleasant remembrance of two good women? Is it seriously meant that what they were counted in Timothy's religion? It is hardly to be doubted that this is the suggestion, and thereupon arise more questions. Have family connexions and a family heritage any bearing upon particular and personal religion? Has the precarious science of eugenics, which is the application of biological science to sociology, any kind of foothold in morals and religion?

1. The idea, at first, wears an attractive look. It looks like a principle of conservation. It looks as if it would solve at least some of the bitterest enigmas. The Kingdom of God might be secured on the simple lines of succession. The law of the Spirit might resolve itself into a law of natural inheritance.

But a suspicion infects the mind. We begin to wonder whether goodness and godliness which came by a way so easy would be worth the name of goodness and godliness. Spiritual achievement would be only a reminiscence. More disconcerting still, such a law of spiritual heritage would of necessity work both ways, if it worked at all. Multitudes would be damned from their birth, and with a finality more real than any social reformer has had to reckon with. So the speculation grows grim and forbidding. Responsibility disappears out of wickedness; value goes out of goodness; worth departs out of character; initiative vanishes from life.

¹ W. P. G. McCormick, *Be of Good Cheer*, 60.

There is more than a disintegrating suspicion about these fancies. The facts of life break the notion to pieces. There is the plain fact of the bad who come of good stock. 'The sons of Eli were sons of Belial.' Happily this is not all that is to be said. If the moral succession cannot be reckoned upon, the immoral succession breaks down also. One of the most sinister life-stories of the Old Testament is lit up by a surprise of this kind. It is the bad story of Jeroboam, of whom the prophet said, 'Thou hast done evil above all that were before thee.' But a light shone in the dark house of Jeroboam, for there was a son of that evil line who was different. He could not save the situation, and, in truth, all that came to him was an honourable grave. But this was not a small thing in a dishonoured line. 'He only of Jeroboam shall come to the grave; because in him there is found some good thing toward the Lord, the God of Israel, in the house of Jeroboam.'

2. What is this talk of good stock or bad? Who is there that is altogether either of one or the other? Be it asked with all reverence, was the genealogy of our Lord Himself without spot or blemish or any such thing? The genealogy stands within the Gospel, and there are significant omissions. 'Joram begat Ozias'; but Joram was not the father of Ozias. Between the two came no less than three ignoble life-stories. It was a recognized principle among the Jews that nefarious names might be dropped out of view in genealogies, but there are names frankly written in the list which lie in shadow. 'There were links of iron and brass in the line, as well as of silver and gold.' The Incarnation has its human roots in the mixed Adam stock.

Timothy's lineage is not exhausted by two good women. Of his father we know nothing, but the surmise is that he was Greek. If then there is talk of heritage, in the blood of Timothy a Greek and a Hebrew strain were mingled, and greater contrast and more probable antagonism could hardly be found.

Thus we are at the problem of heredity, and it is here that biology takes up the discussion. For long we grew accustomed to a determined scientific dogmatism, and we listened so meekly, and found the teaching so insistent and confident that heredity and its problems became an obsession for more than one generation. But the biologist has shed much of the dogmatism, and is not nearly so sure as once. This is the conclusion of one of the foremost biologists of our day: 'What has the biologist to say? Little more than this, that

well-fated, or ill-fated, each living creature is born a new creature—an individuality. There is variation as well as continuity, and the mould is, so to speak, broken each time. Each creature is a new creature. And in the case of man this seems to imply a personality with a will of its own to this extent, that it may or may not use possibilities of nurture in a manner quite unpredictable. The radius of freedom of choice may be long or short, but there is some freedom, *something unpredictable in the activity of each new child.*'

3. There is the religious and Christian view to be stated, and it is no nerveless confronting of a fate, and no helpless bafflement by an enigma. To the Christian, heredity is no iron fate gripping and clamping the individual life in the vice of the past. If inherited evil has power, so has inherited good, and God is greater than any human inheritance, and keeps a power of surprise in His hands for use.

Lois and Eunice are not irrelevancies in the story of Timothy. What they were had much to do with what he was, or they would not have been named with this honour. 'To make a sound Christian of a Hindu,' said a missionary, 'you have got to convert his grandmother.' If it is our lot to be of good stock, let us give thanks for it every day we live. It is a great thing to be in the line of a spiritual aristocracy. Let us take it and acknowledge it as the convenient love of God which made ready for our good, planting in us a quick spiritual sensitiveness.

The late William W. Peyton, in an arresting book, *Memorabilia of Jesus*, has a final chapter with the daring title 'The Christ in our Blood.' He expounds our Lord's boundless faith in the unspoiled elements of our human nature. 'It is the standing danger of all civilizations,' he says, 'and it has been the grave of civilizations, that we forget the early moorland of our birth in the paved streets, stocked shops, bonded warehouses, halls of science, and the artificial lawns of our villas.' There are elements answering to Christ entwined in the primitives of us. And of the human sources of it, he has this to say: 'If you are an earnest man, your Christianity is a transmitted instinct. You have two thousand years of it in your blood.'

There is not a good life lived before us in our stock which has not made the battle of life easier for us.

4. Yet beyond human heritage, and if need be in the teeth of it, there is an immediate and mightier

Power available and at work, and every new thing that comes with every new life is open to the grace of its dealings. 'Something unpredictable in every new life,' says our biologist. That unpredictable is rooted in God. The law of human heritage is transformed and transfigured in the region of redemptive grace into a Divine heredity. At the close of the table of names in St. Luke's Gospel there is an astonishing utterance. Coming at the end of a dull list of births and deaths, it is a declaration staggering in its magnitude. If it is not true, it is a blasphemy, for it is a libel against God. If it is true, it is enough to shame us utterly in the thought of stain upon our kinship, and, at the same time, to bring a catch in the breath as at a sudden glimpse of potentialities beyond our measuring. 'Enos, which was the son of Adam; Adam, which was the son of God.'

There are many things to say in answer to that sinister side of heredity we have been thinking about. That the power of it is limited is a fact verified by experiment and in experience. There is the denial that Nature is mightier than nurture, which was made on the authority of Dr. Barnardo, out of his unique experience in dealing with thousands of young lives. There is the fact that whatever heredity is, it does not put an end to moral freedom and thus to moral responsibility. It may fix our trial but it does not fix our fate.

And there is a greater thing to remember. God, who gave to man his being, made him partake of His own nature. It is only in the fact that man is the child of God that sin gets meaning. It is for us to accept our sonship, to live in the consciousness of it, and in its strength and dignity. We need power for this, and it is what Christ brings—the power to be what we truly are; the power to fulfil our possibilities and reach our destiny.

This was the power Jesus gave and gives to those who believe in Him—a great lifting love, a mighty affection, a carrying enthusiasm—power to become sons of God. If so be that there comes to us, by the far or near human stock to which we belong, an invasion and pressure of God's grace in our very blood—that good thing which was committed unto us, guard through the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us. But if so be that no such reinforcement be ours, let none despair because of it, nor reckon the pull of lower things to be a fate. 'The Eternal has lodging in us; it is ours to turn it into a home.'¹

¹ T. Yates, *The Strategies of Grace*, 158.

'Actors': Christ's Word of Scorn.

BY THE REVEREND DONALD MATHESON, M.A., PEASLAKE, SURREY.

WHEN Jesus called the Pharisees 'hypocrites' He was using a figure of speech which is not suggested to our minds by our English use of the word. This fact partly accounts for our loss, both of the point of Christ's accusation and of the full meaning of the anger which the sin aroused in Him. For His meaning we have substituted the notion of *pretending to be religious*, which is scarcely present in His use of the word. I think we have failed in consequence to guard ourselves as we might from a far commoner vice, which is rarely treated from the pulpit.

It is true that an actor is one who pretends to be what he is not; and that sense is used by Mark in 12¹⁶, and also in different ways by both Matthew and Luke in telling the same story, which apparently they took from Mark.

But an actor is also one whose doings in a play have no moral or religious significance in his case, whether he plays virtue or vice. And this latter meaning will fit all the sixteen other occurrences of the word in the Gospels. In thirteen of these, *all placed on Christ's lips*, this meaning seems the only one that makes sense.

In three of the sixteen (Mt 24⁵¹, Lk 12^{1, 56}) it is difficult to say which of the two meanings is uppermost. But in the great passages where hypocrisy is the main subject (Mt 6¹⁻¹⁸ 15¹⁻¹⁰ = Mk 7¹⁻²³), and Mt 23, as in Lk 6⁴¹⁻⁴⁵ and 13¹⁰⁻¹⁷, there seems no reasonable doubt.

In Mt 6 religious duties performed not for love, or even fear, of God, but to win praise from men are called by Jesus 'hypocrisy,' and are said to have 'no reward,' *i.e.* no moral or religious value. This preference for man's praise as against God's implied, of course, a corresponding effort on the part of other men to impose rules of conduct on their neighbours. Both actor and critic took for granted that it was within man's province to judge others. Both helped to maintain a system which tended to eliminate the thought of God from morals. And Jesus included both partners in the same description. Why else does He label as 'actor' (Mt 7¹⁻⁵ = Lk 6^{42f.}) him who judges his brother, and offers to cast out the 'splinter' from his brother's eye when 'a whole rafter' is in his own?

These passages are typical of all the rest. In Mk 7⁶ (=Mt 15⁷) hypocrisy is defined by Jesus as

'teaching for doctrines commandments of men,' *i.e.* teaching man-made rules of conduct as if they were Torah. People who can remember English evangelical society in the 'sixties and 'seventies of last century can probably recall a number of 'eleventh commandments' about dress, and amusements, and devotions, and Biblical interpretation. Some of these, of course, were excellent in themselves, as was the rule to wash on returning from market. It was the motive that was wrong, the bowing to man's approval till God's approval was left out of account.

How many a man has experienced the reality of God and has begun a new life, but on finding that society about him demands much the same virtues of honesty, kindness, modesty, reverence, church-going, has slipped gradually into the easier obedience, and, to borrow a phrase from the Fourth Gospel (which never names hypocrisy), has 'loved the praise of men more than the praise (δόξαν) of God.'

In the 23rd chapter we find how this hypocrisy shut out the view of God's loving will for men, substituting rules that could either be obeyed or come to terms with on a more or less commercial basis. And this either rendered true religion distasteful ('shut the kingdom'), or made the converts worse casuists than their teachers (vv. 13-22). The tax paid on garden plants, as if they were field-crops, became more important than the greatest commandment (vv. 23-28). The ambition for the approval of men who see the outside made people careless of the judgment of God, who reads the heart (vv. 27, 28); and outward compliance with some of the martyred prophets' words made the hypocrites pay respect to the martyrs' memory while inwardly they were of the mind of the persecutors.

The root of their hypocrisy was that love was left out of their conception of God, and they had no welcome for Christ's message of it, as He indicates in His closing words (vv. 37, 38), 'How often would I . . . and ye would not!'

With regard to the anger of Jesus, may we not say with reverence that the most characteristic trait of His character was His continuous and intense realization of God. God was everything to Him, from His reply as a boy to His mother down to His last words from the Cross. And here was an ethic urged indeed in the interests of the

national religion, yet tending both to ignore the Heavenly Father and to destroy that unity of morals with religion which was fundamental alike to His own message and to true Judaism.

What seems to me a confirmation of this view of Christ's teaching on hypocrisy is found in the Apostle Paul's use of his Master's word. He was missionary pastor at Antioch, a meeting-place of many nationalities and of many vices. He was at least as anxious as any modern missionary for his converts' moral purity. But he deliberately discarded the traditional rules in which he had been brought up, and which had been invented to dissociate pure Jews from vicious heathen. Instead, he trusted to the Spirit of Jesus 'given to all them that obey him.' He and his fellow-apostle, Peter, dined in Gentile houses and shared in the common meal of Christians—Jew and Gentile together. But when old-fashioned Jewish Christians came from Jerusalem, Peter was afraid of what they would think of him. He 'withdrew himself' from such association, even, I suppose, from the *agape*. Paul told him he was an 'actor'; he was playing to a

human audience, not obeying God's will known to him through his moral judgment enlightened by the Spirit of Jesus. Peter carried his bad example so far that other Jews, and even Paul's friend Barnabas, 'joined in his play-acting' (*συνυπεκρίθησαν*). Our versions (A.V. and R.V.) have 'dissembled,' and Lightfoot—to whom men of my generation owe a great debt—has a long note labouring to show that there was religious pretence in Peter's action. But surely that labour is wasted if by 'acting' both Paul and his Master before him meant not 'pretending,' but 'turning duties to God into duties to men.'¹

In that case the passage in Galatians is doubly interesting, both as showing how the technical sense Jesus attached to the word was continued as a criticism of legalism, and also as being one of the few verbal links between the Founder of Christianity and its extender to the Gentile world.

¹ Dr. Streeter (*Four Gospels*, chap. xviii.) seems to think Paul was wrong and Peter right in their difference at Antioch. But that hardly affects the meaning of the word 'dissembled.'

Contributions and Comments.

Matthew xxvi. 50:

'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'

SEVERAL years ago an article upon this text from the pen of Professor Deissmann appeared in this journal. It is now incorporated in the latest English edition of his well-known work, *Light from the Ancient East*. Readers may recall that he was then exulting in the discovery of a Syrian goblet which was inscribed with words that offered an illustration of the text. The inscription encircled the goblet and ran thus: *εὐφραίνου ἐφ' ὃ πάρεi*, or, as it might also be read, *ἐφ' ὃ πάρεi εὐφραίνου*. Professor Deissmann prefers to read the words in the latter order and holds that *ἐφ' ὃ πάρεi* is interrogative, 'Why are you here? Rejoice.' The question and the exhortation are doubtless appropriate to the festive use of the cup. But *ἐφ' ὃ* is not naturally taken as the equivalent of *ἐπὶ τῷ*, and we need not assume a solecism either in the inscription or in the text of Mt 26⁵⁰. The inscription may quite well be read *εὐφραίνου ἐφ' ὃ πάρεi*, 'Rejoice: the thing you are here for,' the ordinary relative sense being retained. And as for the text in Matthew, an excellent meaning is expressed, if

the words *ἐφ' ὃ πάρεi* are taken as exclamatory, 'Companion, the thing you are here for!' It is an ejaculation called forth by the unique crisis of the moment, and involves an appeal that must have pierced the heart of Judas. The poignancy of the appeal is sharpened, if we accept the suggestion of Dr. Rendel Harris that a cup so inscribed may have been used at the Last Supper. For the exclamatory use of the simple relative, cf. Menander, *Epitrepontes*, line 146 (Loeb Classical Library), *ὦ Ἡράκλεις, ἃ πέπονθα!* 'Heracles, how I am treated!' And for a partial parallel to the utterance of Jesus, cf. the exclamatory style of Socrates in Plato, *Euthyphro*, 15 E, *οἶα ποιεῖς, ὦ ἑταῖρε!* Our Lord is, of course, intensely serious, whereas Socrates is ironical.

The Revisers of the English Bible adopted another line of interpretation with the support of Euthymius Zigabenus and the Armagh MS. It apparently found favour in the learned circles of the Greek Church. For that reason, as well as for its own merits, it deserves to be carefully weighed. But the meaning afforded, 'Do that for which thou art come,' is less suitable to the context.

JAMES P. WILSON.

Ayr.

The Cosmic Christ.

'Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.'—Eph 3²¹.

It is beginning to dawn upon us what were the immensities to which St. Paul linked Christ. With advanced science and education, instead of becoming less, they become greater and more staggering in their ramifications and implications. In this chapter he writes about 'the unsearchable riches of Christ,' 'the beginning of the world,' 'principalities and powers in heavenly places,' 'eternal purpose,' and then, as language fails him, he writes about comprehending the breadth, length, depth, and height of the love of God which passes knowledge. Then comes our text as a corner-stone to the temple of infinities, eternities, and immensities.

If Jesus is of present value to me in every circumstance, and if I am to believe others when they say that Jesus is of personal help to them every day, whether they live in any one of the continents outside the one on which I live, and if I am to believe further that Jesus has been a help to millions of men and women for nineteen centuries, then there is no alternative but to accept the standpoint of St. Paul, that Jesus has always been connected with this world in relation to its men and movements. If Jesus can re-create man, there is nothing to prevent linking Him to the creation of man. If Jesus can affect man nowadays, there is no reason why He should not be at the grand consummation the effective person. Once Jesus is admitted to be a person of universal power in a single human or time relation, no logic can keep Him out of all others.

In the benediction which is our text, St. Paul asserts that the glorifying of God is the purpose of Christ. The instrument of the glory is the Church. That fact is staggering, because the Church is an organism that transcends all denominations, sects, and nations. It is bigger than every other organization, higher than, and above all, our barriers. The person to bring about the glory is Jesus Christ. He is the only one in time, or out of it, who is big enough to accomplish such a task. He can attract all colours and classes. In Him there is no colour question and no class caste. Because He reduces all men to sinners, and then transforms them into saints, He has a secret that none else can take away.

It is the extent of the glorifying of God that takes away our breath. In time it is 'throughout all ages.' There is no moment in the past, present,

or future that Jesus does not touch. There is no second to which He is not linked. The glory of God never ceases to reveal itself at any time, because Jesus is in possession of a dominion in which His presence never sets. The British Empire boasts of never having a setting sun, the Dominion of Christ boasts of never having a setting presence. Jesus was back at the creation of the world. Indeed, through Jesus the world was created, and without Him it could never have been created. He is the inspiration of every progress, the inspirer of every advance, the consummation of every purpose, and the end of every movement. Nothing can happen without the Christ or apart from His presence and spirit. When we grasp these immensities, we shall realize with St. Paul that temporary defeats do not matter, for the ultimate triumph is a certainty, and it belongs to Jesus.

But St. Paul suggests something greater than this even. He not only tells us that God's glory is throughout all the ages, but that it is also 'world without end.' Not only time, but place, space, the universe, and the cosmos are subject to Jesus Christ. Jesus not only touches every moment in time, He also touches every particle in creation. 'The whole universe groans and travails,' and the whole universe is to be redeemed. Matter as well as men are in the scheme of re-creation. We have related Jesus to this earth as if this earth were the only thing that concerned the power and love of Christ. Science tells us, however, that this earth is a mere drop in the ocean of planets and suns. There is universe after universe, one following the other in staggering infinities. On the sands, we can only look at the distances and we are lost. Our instruments have failed to measure this universe; they only help us to guess. At best we can only say a little about five hundred stars. No wonder, for the nearest to the earth is ten thousand times as distant as the planet Neptune. Some of the five hundred suns that we know something about are a hundred times as distant as that even. Their light takes four centuries to travel to us. We know there are about six thousand stars which are visible to the naked eye, and there are myriads in addition in the Milky Way. It is assumed that light would take 300,000 years to travel from some of these to earth. Our earth is not far from the centre of our own universe. But what of the other universes that are beyond? In our universe there are 2,000,000,000 luminous suns, which are single and double, giants and dwarfs.

If Jesus is anything, He is what St. Paul claimed Him to be. He is related to the cosmos. He is

linked up with every sun and star. He is the creator and sustainer of every planet. He is the God of every being, be He higher than man or lower.

E. EBRARD REES.

Merthyr Tydfil.

W. Robertson Smith.

MIGHT I venture to correct a slight error, in Mr. Mathieson's excellent survey of Robertson Smith, in regard to Smith's *Prophets*? The date of the second edition of that work, with introduction and additional notes by Cheyne, was not 1902, but seven years earlier. This 1895 edition was further reprinted in 1897.

If it be said that the Lectures themselves, in 1895, were practically a reprint from 1882, the reply may be made that Cheyne in his own introduction to the book speaks of 'the present work' as now appearing 'in a second edition.' That introduction is dated August 1895.

It is interesting to note that in the bibliography which he prepared for the third edition of *The Religion of the Semites*, Dr. S. A. Cook dates the second edition of the *Prophets* in 1902, as he also does in his important article 'Jews' in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 15, p. 373, col. i. On the other hand, in the full and excellent bibliographies attached to chapters xvii.-xx. of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. iii. (prepared, I presume, by Dr. Cook), the date of the second edition of the *Prophets* is given as 1895.

WILLIAM SCOTT.

Dundonald, Kilmarnock.

Mr. Scott is correct in giving 1895 as the date of the first issue of the second edition, with Cheyne's introduction and notes, of *The Prophets of Israel*. Besides the reprinting in 1897, there was one in 1902, followed by a reissue in 1907, to which last the copy I use belongs. In setting down 1902 as the date of the second edition, I was following the long and detailed bibliography appended to Robertson Smith's *Life* by Black and Chrystal. That bibliography does not mention the second edition of the *Prophets* under 1895, but gives the reprinting under 1902. I was puzzled as to the reason for this, because I was well aware that Cheyne's augmented edition had been issued in the year after Robertson Smith's death. However, I decided to quote the date thus given in the official bibliography as probably intended to represent

the definitive issue. The proper connexion of the second edition with the year 1895 is mentioned in the *Life* in a footnote at p. 459, which is worth quoting: 'The edition of *The Prophets of Israel*, with Introduction and Additional Notes by Professor Cheyne, published in 1895, may safely be taken as indicating the direction in which Professor Smith's mind had been moving during the interval between the first publication of these lectures and his lamented death.'

W. M. MATHIESON.

Broughty Ferry.

Philemon and Slavery.

MAY I supplement Dr. Tuting's letter (September 1929) with a word or two? Quoting from the *Fragmenta of Philemon*, he sent me to the *Fragmenta of Euripides*, where I knew I could find many things of like purport on slavery. Oddly enough I had just been protesting against a testimonial to a distinguished editor which ended with the words 'defence of the poor and oppressed.' My feeling was that defence of *all alike* was finer, and Euripides' assertion, repeated again and again, is that freemen and slaves are *alike* in their faults and their virtues. The lost *Melanippe* had some fine things in it; but perhaps the best lines for quotation are from the *Ion* (845-6):

ἐν γὰρ τι τοῖς δούλοις αἰσχύνῃν φέρει
τοῦνομα· τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐλευθέρων
οὔδεις κακίων δούλος, ὅστις ἐσθλὸς ᾗ.

This corresponds very closely with the Fragment of Philemon, which Dr. Tuting has kindly sent me:

κἂν δούλος ᾗ τις, σάρκα τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει·
φύσει γὰρ οὔδεις δούλος ἐγενήθη ποτέ,
ᾗ δ' αὖ τύχη τὸ σῶμα κατεδουλώσατο.

BERNARD G. HALL.

Knutsford.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.